Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-099
Monday
23 May 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-099

23 May 1988

CONTENTS

Arms Control & Disarmament

Foreign Affairs Commissions Recommend INF 1
Korniyenko Views INF Ratification Attitudes 1
Ponomarev Views Prospects for Summit Arms Deal *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 May]* 1
U.S. Conducts 'Yet Another' Nuclear Test 2
Chernyshev Calls for Realism in Military Sphere 3
Cranes Being Mounted on 'SS-20' Transporters 4
Army Officer Cited on CSSR Peace Initiatives *[Prague CTK]* 5
CSSR Ratifies Inspection Agreement 5
'International Situation—Questions and Answers' *[Ptashnikov, Chernyshev]* 5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Further Reportage on Interaction Council Session 6
Demichev Addresses Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 19 May]* 9
Demichev, Romania's Manescu Meet *[Bucharest AGERPRES]* 9
Japan's Fukuda Speaks 10
FRG's Schmidt Holds Briefing 10
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' *[Shishlin, Kobysh, Lavrentyev]* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gorbachev Interview With U.S. Press Reported *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 11
Further on Interview *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 15
Further Reportage on Upcoming Moscow Summit 19
Dates Announced 25
More on Reagan Interview *[IZVESTIYA 21 May]* 25
Glazunov Comments 25
Shultz Comments Cited 25
More on Shultz Assessment 26
Senate Debate on INF Treaty Continues 26
Amendment Rejected 27
Reagan Urges Ratification 27
Senate 'Dragging Its Feet' 27

China

NPC Vice Chairman Meets Soviet Delegation 27
Friendship Delegation Arrives in Beijing 28
Hydrology Protocol Signed in Beijing 28
CPC's Tian Jiyun Interviewed on Economic Reform *[IZVESTIYA 18 May]* 28

Northeast Asia

Trawler Reportedly Runs Aground North of Japan 28
Passengers of Burned Ship Leave Japan 31
Japan Fishery Negotiations in Moscow Close 31
Biryukova Leaves DPRK for Home 21 May 31
Met by Lukyanov 32
DPRK Denies Contacts With South Korea 32
South Koreans Oppose U.S. Military Presence 32

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Further Reportage on Thai Prime Minister's Visit 33
Prem Speaks on ASEAN *[Bangkok Voice of Free Asia]* 33
Sitthi Holds Bangkok Briefing *[Bangkok Voice of Free Asia]* 34
Prem Holds News Conference 35
Joint Communique Signed *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 36
Prem Departs 22 May 38
Volskiy Comments on Visit 38
New Zealand Parliamentarians Begin USSR Visit 39
Greeted by Voss *[IZVESTIYA 20 May]* 39
Received by Gromyko 39
SRV Foreign Minister Makes Moscow Stopover 41

Near East & South Asia

Last Troop Unit Leaves Nangarhar Province 41
Infantry Unit Returns 41
Moscow Endorses Afghan Charge Against Pakistan *[IZVESTIYA 21 May]* 41
Egypt's 'Abd al-Majid Continues Visit 42
Meets Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 21 May]* 42
Talks With Shevardnadze *[PRAVDA 21* 43
Shevardnadze Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 2. May]* 44
'Abd al-Majid Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 21 May]* 46
Joint Communique *[PRAVDA 22 May]* 48
Dubinin Elaborates Stand on Mideast Settlement *[Tel Aviv 'AL HAMISHMAR 19 May]* 50
KUNA Cites Soviet, Israeli Conference Talks *[Kuwait]* 51

East Europe

Further on MSZMP Conference Proceedings 51
Kadar Addresses Conference 52
Grosz, Kadar Take New Posts 52
Gorbachev Congratulates Grosz *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 53
Greets New Chairman Kadar *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 53
Grosz Profiled *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 53
Grosz Interviewed on Economic Emphases *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 21]* 54
CPCZ's Jakes Stops Over in Moscow 55

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Armenia, Azerbaijan Party Chiefs Replaced 57
Armenian Appeal to Gorbachev *[AFP]* 57
Vezirov Replaces Bagirov 57
Arutyunyan Replaces Demirchyan 57
Demonstrations Resume in Baku *[AFP]* 57
Armenians Moving to Nagorno-Karabakh *[AFP]* 58
Armenians Demonstrate in Moscow *[AFP]* 58
Yakovlev Addresses Armenian Plenum *[PRAVDA 22 May]* 58
Ligachev Attends Azerbaijan Plenum *[PRAVDA 22 May]* 59
Vilnius Rally Honors Stalin Victims 59
'Extremists' Demonstrate 59
'Dozen' Reported Arrested *[AFP]* 60
Gorbachev Addresses Central Committee Plenum 60
CPSU Adopts Resolution on Kurgan Obkom 60
Zaykov at Moscow Consumer Goods Meeting 60
Zaykov, Murakhovskiy Visit Food Enterprises *[PRAVDA 19 May]* 61
Shcherbitskiy Tours Kirovograd 11 May *[Kiev]* 61
Vorotnikov Returns to Moscow From Buryatiya 61

Baklanov Visits Voskresensk Fertilizer Plant *[PRAVDA 19 May]* 62
Batalin Addresses Monuments Conservation Forum *[PRAVDA 18 May]* 62
Supreme Soviet Deputies Begin Registering 63
Supreme Soviet To Debate Housing Problem 63
Oblast Party Committees Elect New Leaders 63
Local Parties Elect Conference Delegates 64
Kirghizia Elections 64
Turkmenistan, Tajikstan 64
Semipalitinsk Oblast 64
Murmansk Elects 100 64
Gorbachev Talk With Church Leaders Lauded *[Nezhnyy in MOSCOW NEWS No 19]* 64
Obkom Leader Describes Restructuring Work *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 9 May]* 65
Moscow City Prosecutor Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 13 May]* 70
Restructuring of Legal System Viewed *[PRAVDA 12 May]* 73
Academic Comments on Criminal Law Reform *[PRAVDA 14 May]* 74
Danger of 'Vulgar Stalinism' Described *[MOSCOW NEWS No 19]* 76
Weekly's Readers Discuss Andreyeva Letter *[MOSCOW NEWS No 18]* 77
Moscow TV Highlights Museum for Pasternak 80
Briefs 81
Belorussian SSR Appointment 81
Press Center Information 81

Economics

Abalkin Discusses Prospects for Reform *[NEDELYA No 19]* 81

Agricultural

Shvets Outlines Benefits of Lease Contract *[IZVESTIYA 19 May]* 86

Military

Gromyko Presents Awards, Details Achievements 87

Foreign Affairs Commissions Recommend INF

LD2305130488 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The Foreign Affairs Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers recommended to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet ratifying the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

At their joint session in the Kremlin today the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet (council) of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR reached the conclusion that the provisions of the treaty and the attendant documents meet the security interests of the Soviet Union and its allies as well as broader intersts of lessening the threat of war and strengthening peace.

The commissions arrived at the positive conclusions also regarding the reliability of the measures to verify compliance with the treaty, which are envisaged by it, and regarding other aspects of the treaty.

Korniyenko Views INF Ratification Attitudes

LD2005173288 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—TASS diplomatic correspondent Vadim Biryukov writes:

A joint meeting of the Commissions on Foreign Affairs of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet was appointed to be held on Monday, May 23. The discussion of the question of the ratification of the Soviet-American treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles that started on February 9 will be continued there. Georgiy Korniyenko, chairman of the preparatory commission to draft recommendations and proposals for the Commissions on Foreign Affairs of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, answered questions from the TASS diplomatic correspondent today.

Question: Will the process of the ratification have been concluded in the Soviet Union by the Soviet-American summit in Moscow?

Answer: It is difficult to predict how many days this discussion will last, as it depends on the course of the debates at the joint meeting of the Commissions on Foreign Affairs of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet. We believe the process of the ratification of the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles should be concluded by the coming Soviet-American summit. We see no reasons for this not to happen.

Question: What is the attitude of Soviet citizens to the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles?

Answer: Proceeding from the debates at meetings of the preparatory commission and the contents of the letters from Soviet citizens addressed to the Supreme Soviet and the mass media, we have no doubt that the treaty is supported by the absolute majority of the Soviet people. They unambiguously declared for its ratification.

But different views are also expressed. Separate Soviet citizens came out against the ratification, explaining this by the view that "imperialists are not to be trusted." Others express concern over the fact that the Soviet Union will have to destroy a greater number of missiles than the United States, while the number of British and French intermediate-range missiles is not limited and the treaty does not apply to them. Will this not damage the security of our country? This question worries many people. The preparatory commission had to work a great deal to establish if there are reasons for concern. As a result of this, the unambiguous conclusion is drawn in the report of the preparatory commission: There are no objective reasons for doubts about the expediency of the treaty. Everything is balanced in the treaty in such a way that the defence potentials of the Soviet Union and its allies should not be damaged.

Yes, concessions on our part were made during the working out of the treaty, but there were also concessions from the U.S. side. The sides conceded to each other just as much as was necessary for concluding the treaty which is in keeping with the interests of the two countries and the world community.

Question: How do you assess the debates in the Senate of the U.S. Congress on the problem of the ratification of the treaty?

Answer: President of the United States Ronald Reagan and the administration on the whole proceed from the desirability of concluding the process of ratification of the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles by the beginning of the Moscow meeting so as to exchange the instruments of ratification during the meeting. But the discussion of this question in the Senate shows that with the prevailing positive attitude to the treaty, there are legislators who are striving to prevent its ratification.

One would like to hope that common sense and the forces in the Senate that declare for the ratification of the treaty will prevail. At the same time, in the 40 odd years that I have devoted to the studies of the USA, I have learnt not to be surprised at any turns in the political life of that country.

Ponomarev Views Prospects for Summit Arms Deal

PM2305103388 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[Observer M. Ponomarev Military-Political Review: "The Peoples Are Waiting"]

[Text] Just a few days separate us from the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting—the fourth in the past 3 years. Next Sunday U.S. President R. Reagan should arrive in Moscow. A new page will start to be filled in the annals of relations between the USSR and the United States.

What do we all expect from this meeting? What importance will it have for untangling the very complex questions which perturb not only the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States but also all mankind? In the most general form, we can answer this question as follows: Both sides proceed from the premise that M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan must carry out an in-depth exchange of opinions on the entire spectrum of problems of world politics and thoroughly examine the fundamental aspects of mutual relations between the two countries. We want to hope that the Moscow summit will be a major event in international life and will serve the cause of the further restructuring of the entire system of international relations on the basis of the new political thinking. This meeting should lend additional impetus to the processes of the forward development of Soviet-U.S. relations. The 19 May CPSU Central Committee Politburo session confirmed the Soviet side's intention to do everything necessary to ensure that the forthcoming meeting becomes an important stage on the path to preparation of a package of strategic offensive armaments and ABM accords.

What is the basis for the hope that the new Soviet-U.S. summit will end with substantial political results and that its outcome will be of important significance for the world development trends taking shape? Here we should recall, above all, that in the world today, objective new realities have arisen which no one can fail to consider. They are urgently dictating to all peoples and states the need to elaborate common positions and to seek and find a balance between diverse interests.

Proceeding from a comprehensive analysis and consideration of reality, the Soviet leadership has drawn far reaching conclusions and elaborated new approaches to the solution of the most acute world problems. Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington have been major milestones on the path to the solution of these problems. At the Geneva meeting, the leaders of the USSR and the United States reached the conclusion that in a nuclear war there will be no victors, that such a war cannot be unleashed. In Reykjavik a real breakthrough was accomplished toward a nuclear-free, nonviolent world. And although, because of the United States' blind allegiance to the "Star Wars" program, no practical decisions were achieved there, Reykjavik predetermined the success of the Washington meeting. This meeting was marked by the signing of the USSR-US Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles—the first international agreement in history on the simultaneous destruction of two classes of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles.

All this has created a new atmosphere in Soviet-U.S. relations. Many questions which were previously only discussed have proved to be at the stage of practical solution. They include questions like a treaty on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive armaments, a convention on banning chemical weapons, a mandate for talks on conventional armaments, and the limitation of nuclear and chemical weapons tests.

Both the USSR and the United States believe that although various questions—regional conflict situations, human rights, and humanitarian cooperation—are on the agenda, the central task is the elaboration of an agreement on reducing strategic offensive armaments under conditions of the observance of the ABM Treaty. The Soviet side is making every effort for the successful completion of the talks. In particular, during the May meeting between the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state, the U.S. side was presented with detailed information about the composition of the Soviet side's strategic forces, including information on our sea-launched cruise missiles.

To all appearances, the preparation of the treaty will not be successfully completed in time for the start of R. Reagan's Moscow visit. But there remains the task of scaling the maximum heights as a result of the agreement on the reduction of strategic offensive armaments. Then the Moscow meeting will be an important stage on the path to a new treaty which is objectively necessary both to us and to the Americans.

But it must be considered that two trends, two approaches to world politics, are doing battle in the United States. This duality has been reflected in several of the recent speeches by the White House incumbent. You only have to recall his speech in Springfield, which was couched in the spirit of the times of the "cold war." But statements which can be assessed very positively have also appeared in the president's speeches. Thus, speaking in Chicago recently, R. Reagan pointed to the need to eliminate the nuclear threat. "We now have weapons which can destroy the world," he said, "and why should we not be more clearly aware of the threat and join together for a single purpose—to use safe, sensible methods to rapidly rid the world of this threat looming over our civilization and existence."

The dissent in Washington is not only manifested in speeches. It is assuming the most diverse forms. I shall permit myself to recall the spectacle (there is nothing else you can call it) played out in the U.S. Senate in connection with the ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. There is no doubt that this is

a very serious document which also required painstaking discussion in our country. But after all the senators put over 1,300 written questions about the treaty to the administration and some, like J. Helms, asserted completely seriously that the treaty undermines U.S. security and leaves the United States unarmed in the face of the "perfidious Soviets" whom the treaty allegedly "commits to nothing."

The full Senate has now embarked on a discussion of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. But many other facts can be cited attesting to the activeness of U.S. militarist forces. For instance, you only have to turn to the bill on military appropriations for fiscal 1989, a discussion of which is being completed in the U.S. Congress. The ceiling for these appropriations has been set at $299.5 billion. Here Congress' attempts to somewhat restrict some of the items of expenditure, particularly on the SDI program, are meeting with the administration's resolute resistance. At the same time, Congress itself is encouraging the emergence of new militarist programs. Thus, the Senate has adopted an amendment to the bill on military appropriations calling for the modernization of nuclear tactical armaments, to which the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles does not extend.

It is also known that the U.S. defense secretary has given the order for the start of full-scale work on the creation of a system for launching MX ICBM's from railroad platforms. In all it is planned to station 50 first strike ICBM's on such platforms. In addition NEWSWEEK has reported that the U.S. Air Force is examining plans for the development of two new ICBM's—the Minuteman-4 and the Minuteman-5—with one and two warheads respectively. Nuclear tests are continuing as before. Since July 1945, the United States has carried out over 920 nuclear explosions with a total yield of 11,500 atom bombs of the type dropped on Hiroshima.

Well, that is the reality of the world in which we live. We must take account of the fact that with one hand, U.S. representatives are signing agreements in Geneva on settling the political situation around Afghanistan, and with the other, they are compiling an appeal to the leaders of the armed opposition in that country to continue the civil war even after the withdrawal of Soviet troops. That is the policy of neoglobalism that the U.S. ruling circles are pursuing. It essentially legalizes U.S. military interference in virtually all corners of the planet for the sake of "the defense of the national security interests" of America by eliminating governments whose policy Washington does not like or by supporting the most reactionary regimes.

The "doctrine of neoglobalism" is usually linked with the name of the head of the present U.S. Administration. But its sources can also be traced in the past. The 70th anniversary of the day the U.S. cruiser "Olympia" entered Murmansk port falls on 24 May. U.S. servicemen came ashore from this cruiser. Thus began the U.S. military intervention in the north of our country. At almost the same time, U.S. troops landed in the Far East.

We should not forget this or the casualties inflicted on us in those years by the foreign military intervention. But history also gives us other examples. During the fierce war against a common enemy—Hitler's Germany—U.S. convoys with arms for the Soviet Union entered that same port of Murmansk. The brave U.S. sailors led these convoys through the "wolf packs" of Hitler's submarines to help their combat ally in his selfless struggle against a hated enemy.

Yes, the history of Soviet-U.S. relations is not simple. Let's recall our countries' signing of the important document that was the SALT II Treaty. But let us also recall that the United States itself at first refused to ratify this treaty and then deviated from it, increasing the limits it set for strategic arms.

On the eve of the Moscow meeting, I should like there to be fewer and fewer of these contradictory elements in our relations. Even better, I should like there to be none at all. Is this possible? Yes, it is. Life confirms this on the basis of large and small examples. Here is one of them. Soviet and U.S. scientists have just come out with a joint initiative, urging the USSR and the United States to conclude an agreement committing the two sides to not putting nuclear reactors into near-earth orbit. The agreement should provide for the two sides' renunciation of the use of nuclear reactors for military purposes, including as power installations on satellites. An effective barrier could thus be erected on the path of the arms race in space.

Talks instead of confrontation, the reduction of levels of military antagonism instead of the arms race, the growth of the Soviet leadership's popularity—this was what was highlighted by the participants in a recent public opinion poll in the United States. At the same time, the poll showed that current stereotypes about the Soviet Union are still strong in Americans' minds. They can be overcome if dialogue between the countries is expanded. That is the requirement of the times. That is why there is no doubt—and I want to stress this yet again—that the peoples are awaiting the Moscow meeting with impatience. It is being awaited by Soviet people; it is being awaited by Americans; it is being awaited by all people of the world, by all those who want a peaceful life for themselves, those close to them, and their children.

U.S. Conducts 'Yet Another' Nuclear Test

LD2205073888 Moscow TASS in English 0732 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] San Francisco May 22 TASS—TASS correspondents Yuriy Algunov and Andrey Sidorin report:

The United States carried out yet another nuclear test in Nevada on Saturday.

An official spokesman for the main test range of the Department of Energy, Jim Boyer, said an underground explosion code-named Laredo was detonated successfully. The yield of the nuclear warhead was 20 to 150 kilotons. The seismic instruments installed along the perimeter of the test range recorded an earth jolt corresponding in magnitude to a medium-scale earthquake. Its epicentre was 120 km northwest of Las Vegas at a depth of half a kilometre inside the rock formations of Nevada desert where an explosive device was mounted in a special shaft.

The test became the fourth one announced by the United States since January this year, and the 679th one since the Nevada test range began to function in 1951. The previous test was conducted exactly a week ago.

The opinion of spokesmen for local anti-war organisations is that the frequency of nuclear tests may be an indirect evidence of intensification of work to modernize U.S. nuclear arsenals and to replenish them with new types of weapons of mass destruction based on the utilization of thermonuclear energy. It is a question, first of all, of the implementation of the "Star Wars" programme.

Owing to adverse weather conditions in the area of the test range, Laredo which had been originally scheduled for last Thursday was repeatedly postponed.

On the eve of the detonation, specialists of the energy department recommended that erectors of high-rise buildings in Las Vegas abandon construction sites for the period of the tests owing to the danger of strong vibrations of soil.

Chernyshev Calls for Realism in Military Sphere

LD2105203288 Moscow TASS in English 2009 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS—Follows commentary by TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev:

Robert McFarlane, former assistant to the President for national security affairs, made a very noteworthy statement on the Strategic Defence Initiative program, addressing the other day the House Armed Services Committee. He spoke frankly about the impracticability of the idea of building an anti-missile "space shield" and the absurdity of the claim of the U.S. Administration to the effect that the implementation of SDI would lead to a nuclear-free world.

Properly speaking McFarlane did not say anything that would be unknown until now. Another thing is important, his admissions indicate that when in his high office, he was forced to say quite different things, reiterating again and again far-fetched arguments in defence of SDI. Now as a common American citizen McFarlane has the possibility to express his real attitude to that program, calling a spade a spade.

Worthy of respect is the admission by the former Presidential assistant that he feels guilty for the people of the United States being deceived as regards their security. Since, as McFarlane noted, experts had informed the President that the SDI was a utopia, spendings on the implementation of the SDI program would be enormous and that the program would be seen as that in preparation for a pre-emptive nuclear strike. That warning was made even before the President came forward with his initiative in 1983. Now the U.S. Administration has somewhat improved its ability to see things clearly. Its officials no longer speaks about an "impenetrable shield", yet they insist that the anti-ballistic missile system is "useful" and even "partially effective". Now they seem to have forgotten the declarations made by them in the past that if strategic defence systems are combined with offensive systems they can be viewed as a factor of an aggressive policy. Nowadays the U.S. leadership speaks not so much about SDI as being a "path to a nuclear-free world", as about their wish to "strengthen nuclear deterrence" by means of the ABM system, i.e. add anti-ballistic missile defence to the strategic nuclear arsenals.

As a result of all that, support for SDI in the USA is declining. Since at the initial stages the popularity of SDI among Americans was explained by the fact that it was advertised as a program for "full defence" from nuclear missiles, whereas now it has become obvious that in any eventuality the "umbrella" will be all in holes.

Meanwhile the USSR proposes a real way towards eliminating the nuclear threat through the destruction of the nuclear arsenals themselves. This makes many people give serious thought to the question, what is SDI good for, is it worthwhile spending on it so much money?

It is necessary to note a certain change manifesting itself now within the U.S. military-industrial complex itself. An intensification of work in the field of SDI, especially transition to the system's deployment in outer space will take, according to the estimates of American experts, 15-20 billion dollars or even more a year with these aims. The economic difficulties through which the USA is going, the "overburdened" military budget leave, as a matter of fact, no place for financing new military programs without substantive cut in other articles in the Pentagon's military budget. Therefore the prospect of enormous sums being earmarked for SDI is a source of concern for some representatives of the military industrial complex.

And, at last, the Soviet Union's reaction to SDI has disappointed the U.S. military-political establishment. One of the objectives of the program was economic exhaustion of the Soviet Union, i.e. the wish to make it

set aside enormous appropriations on space weapons. They in the U.S. Administration clearly hoped for an inertia of Soviet political thinking, the ambition which we had for a long time, to "overtake" America in the military field, by copying its new developments. But on this issue too official Washington has underestimated the change currently underway in the USSR, has failed to take into consideration the dynamism and flexibility shown by us now also in the military-political field. The response from our side has come as a surprise to the USA. The Soviet leadership said that the counter-measures against SDI will be not the creation of our own SDI, they will be assymetrical, by far simpler and cheaper.

I believe that the U.S. leaders would be well advised to display realism in the military-political field in the lifetime of the administration. The more so that there are possibilities for making a real step towards substantive cuts in the strategic-offensive weapons of the USSR and the USA. This takes, as the Soviet Union proposes, an agreement on a strict observance of the ABM Treaty, the way it was signed in 1982 and non-abandonment of that treaty in the course of an agreed time.

Cranes Being Mounted on 'SS-20' Transporters

LD2005211388 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Odessa May 20 TASS—Work has begun on mounting the first crane on the transporter vehicle of a medium-range missile, known in the West as SS-20, at the heavy-duty crane plant in Odessa, a port city on the Black Sea. This work is done in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. treaty on medium-and shorter-range missiles, under which nuclear weapons should be eliminated, while other hardware used for peaceful purposes. The machine builders in Odessa were instructed to manufacture mobile cranes for the construction, mounting them on missile chassis.

The Soviet side proposed partnership to the Swiss-West German firm Liebherr. An agreement was reached, under which the firm will begin a 120-tonne mechanism for the Odessa plant.

Army Officer Cited on CSSR Peace Initiatives

LD2005124388 Prague CTK in English 1110 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 20 (CTK correspondent)—Czechoslovakia's proposal to create a zone of confidence, cooperation and good neighbourly relations along the line dividing the Warsaw Treaty and NATO states has been characterized as an expression of a comprehensive approach to ensuring European security by a high Soviet military official.

First Deputy Chief of Staff of Soviet Armed Forces Colonel General Vladimir Lobov in an interview with CTK pointed out the connection between Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear arms cuts and the peace initiatives of Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries.

Talks between Moscow and Washington on a treaty on a 50-per cent cut in strategic offensive weapons do not proceed at a desired pace, one of the causes being lack of confidence. Thus, the significance of initiatives submitted by Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries rests in the fact that they are aimed at not only at reducing the level of military confrontation but also at eliminating suspicion and enhancing confidence between East and West. These proposals contribute to a speedy signing of a treaty on strategic arms cuts which is of extraordinary importance for the continuation of the disarmament process.

The Soviet Union, firmly convinced that European security can be ensured only by political means, fully supports the Czechoslovak proposal submitted by Communist Party General Secretary Milos Jakes, Colonel General Lobov said and emphasized that the implementation of this proposal would contribute to the demilitarization of central Europe and elmination of nuclear as well as conventional weapons from this part of Europe.

However, the significance of the Czechoslovak proposal is broader as it envisages a comprehensive approach towards European security. Military detente must be supported with progress in all spheres of cooperation—political, economic, ecological and humanitarian.

The Czechoslovak proposal is a plan to ensure security on the basis of cooperation and not confrontation. All socialist countries strive at present to push through this principle, the Soviet military representative said.

CSSR Ratifies Inspection Agreement

LD1805210988 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 18 May 88

[Text] Prague May 18 TASS—President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic Gustav Husak ratified today an agreement on inspections between Czechoslovakia, the USSR and the GDR that was signed in Berlin on December 11, 1987 in connection with the Treaty between the USSR and the USA on the Elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles.

This agreement will go into effect simultaneously with the coming into effect of the Soviet-American treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles which was signed in Washington on December 8, 1987.

'International Situation—Questions and Answers'
LD2105040088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 20 May 88

["International Situation—Questions and Answers" program presented by Andrey Ptashnikov, All-Union foreign policy commentator, with Vladimir Nikolayevich Chernyshev, TASS observer on military affairs, Boris Andrianov, commentator, Igor Surguchev, commentator, and (Yuriy Modayev), international affairs journalist]

[Excerpts] [Ptashnikov] Hello, comrades. Every time we sort out our program's mail, we are convinced that significant numbers of radio listeners are primarily interested in questions on various aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations and, particularly, with problems linked to disarmament and cutting weapons. This is quite understandable, for you see the development of international events and the political climate on the planet depend on the policies of the USSR and the United States to a significant, and at times, to a decisive, extent.

At this time, there are grounds for asserting that the climate has changed for the better. I am thinking of both the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range missiles signed in Washington and the Geneva agreements on settling the situation around Afghanistan, in accordance with which on 15 May, the Soviet Union began withdrawing its limited contingent of troops from that country. The revived contacts between the USSR and the United States in the areas of science, culture, and trade must also be mentioned. Just a little over a week remains until President Reagan visits Moscow. I am sure that I will be expressing the common hope that the latest Soviet-U.S. summit will bring real results, not only in the matter of establishing mutual understanding and trust between our countries, but also in saving mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

So the positive developments are there to be seen; nonetheless, we note with regret—and, esteemed comrades, this is also clearly stressed in your letters—that the new political thinking on which the policy of the USSR is based, has not yet met with the desired response from official Washington. [passage omitted]

To judge from your letters, esteemed comrades, the prospect of signing such a treaty meets with your full support and approval. [passage omitted]. At the same time, almost all letters express anxiety that the White House's policy—first and foremost, its position on SDI—may become the main obstacle on the road to a successful completion of talks on 50-percent reductions in strategic offensive weapons. Taking part in our program is Vladimir Nikolayevich Chernyshev, TASS observer on military affairs. I have asked him, as a specialist, to talk in greater detail about all the existing problems and difficulties in that area. So, Vladimir Nikolayevich, my first question: How do things stand at the moment with working out a treaty on 50-percent reductions in strategic offensive weapons?

[Chernyshev] First of all, I would like to draw attention to two points: First, the treaty will not be ready for the Moscow summit. Summits as said by Comrade Shevardnadze, are not the end objective but are an important stage on the road to this treaty. Second, both the Soviet and U.S. sides still believe that progress in working out an agreement on strategic offensive weapons, while observing the ABM Treaty, ought to be the central task in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue. Undoubtedly the leaders of the USSR and United States, once they meet in Moscow, will have the opportunity to come to an agreement over those complicated questions which are still making progress difficult, and there are not many such questions. I am thinking of questions of principle and not purely technical ones. The fingers on one hand would be enough to count them. Having resolved them, it would be possible to remove a multitude of other small questions which depend on them.

[Ptashnikov] Well, could you not, by way of example, name these questions of principle and problems?

[Chernyshev] To touch on the content of the treaty on strategic offensive weapons itself, first of all, it is necessary to name the serious problems connected with limiting long-range sea-based cruise missiles, with the method for counting air-based cruise missiles, with the setting of sublevels for individual elements of the strategic triad, with mobile intercontinental missiles, and with verification of the observance of the treaty.

[Ptashnikov] Well what, for example, are the complications with sea-based cruise missiles?

[Chernyshev] The question about these missiles is in essence a question about how to ensure the effectiveness of an agreement, that is, to close off the possibility for bypassing those levels of strategic weapons which will remain after the reductions envisioned by an agreement. I will explain this point: Agreement has already been reached at the talks on this: After the 50-percent reductions, the numbers of remaining strategic offensive weapons, that is, land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, ballistic missiles on submarines, and strategic bombers, will not exceed 1,600 units in each country. Maximum levels have been agreed for the general quantity of strategic warheads: 6,000 units. But sea-based long-range cruise missiles do not come into the enumerated levels of carriers and warheads. If their numbers are not limited then, for example, the United States, through the buildup of this class of weaponry, could obtain a strategic advantage.

Therefore, thanks to the persistent efforts of the Soviet side, it was possible to include into the joint Soviet-U.S. summit statement during the last meeting in Washington, a clause saying that the sides will find a mutually

acceptable solution on the question of limiting the deployment of sea-based cruise missiles equipped with nuclear warheads. These limitations will not be associated with their counting in 1,600 means of delivery and in 6,000 units of warheads, but, nonetheless, strict limitations on deployment ought to exist. Nonetheless, at the talks in Geneva, through the fault of the U.S. side, there is no success at all in attempts to turn all of this into a concrete agreement. The U.S. delegation, for example, refers to the fact that it is supposedly impossible to verify the presence of such missiles on ships and that means that it is apparently useless to introduce limitations. Taking into account the U.S. side's statement about it being impossible to verify sea-based cruise missiles, the Soviet Union has put forward such a plan which would include an entire set of means and methods. This includes in particular remote control [kontrol] over the presence of nuclear missiles on a ship, on-the-spot verification of the equipping of missiles with nuclear warheads, and inspection of submarines and surface ships. Our specialists think that the use of such a set will make it possible to conduct effective verification. The Americans are studying the Soviet proposal, but as yet the problem of limiting sea-based missiles has not been solved at the talks.

[Ptashnikov] But if we take air-based cruise missiles: Still, it is simpler and easier to count them, is that not so?

[Chernyshev] Well, not quite. At least, the U.S. side interprets this question in its own way. Everything came to a standstill on this question over how to count heavy bombers carrying such missiles, totalling the 1,600 strategic carriers, which are to remain after the reduction. Further, there is still disagreement over how many missiles to count on each type of bomber, so as to set their total number at a level of 6,000 nuclear warheads in the general strategic arsenal. The U.S. side tabled proposals on this issue, such as once again opening up the possibility of circumventing the set restrictions. The essence of its proposal amounts to the following: The United States proposed that heavy bombers should be separated into three categories. The first is heavy bombers equipped with long-distance cruise missiles with nuclear bombs. Each bomber should be counted as 1 unit of 1,600 carriers, and as 10 units of 6,000 nuclear warheads to be permitted to the USSR and United States.

The second category is that of bombers equipped with bombs or short-range missiles with nuclear bombs. Each such aircraft would be counted as a unit, both amounting to 1,600 carriers, and amounting to 6,000 warheads. The third category is that of heavy bombers carrying any sort of weapon, either bombs or missiles, not equipped with nuclear warheads.

The flaw in this scheme is that the United States would essentially be able to have hundreds of bombers which would not come under any accounting, would not be restricted by any methods at all, but would be part of standard equipment [sostoyat na vooruzhenii] and which could, given existing modern technology, be fairly quickly re-equipped into nuclear weapon carriers. This is clear from the numerical data which the United States handed over to the Soviet side in respect to the number of heavy bombers it has. Even now, over 250 heavy bombers which the U.S. Air Force has in reserve fail to be mentioned in these data. It is clear that this sort of approach to resolving an important issue cannot be accepted. The U.S. side must correct it.

[Ptashnikov] What is the Soviet side's position on this issue?

[Chernyshev] The Soviet Union has proposed that each heavy bomber, regardless of how it is equipped, should be counted along with the number of strategic carriers, that is, 1,600 units; while its equipment should be counted according to how it is actually equipped. Even now, the U.S. heavy bombers are equipped with not 10 but 13 cruise missiles. The USSR, therefore, proposes getting to know both the Soviet aircraft—which are equipped with six missiles—and also the U.S. bombers, and setting the number of nuclear bombs which would be ascribed to each heavy bomber in accordance with its type. Only a concrete approach such as this would evidently enable the question of counting heavy bombers and air-based cruise missiles to be resolved objectively.

[Ptashnikov] Well, now for the question that the majority of our radio listeners asks: namely, the connection between the process of reducing strategic offensive weapons and the ABM treaty and the U.S. SDI.

[Chernyshev] The current position of the Soviet Union is the following: It is ready to go for a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons, provided that both sides obligate themselves to strictly observe the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, and not to exceed that treaty for an agreed period. Insofar as SDI does not contradict the ABM Treaty, that program is not relevant to the Geneva negotiations. It should be pointed out that over the last year there has been a change in attitude toward SDI in the Soviet Union. I will try to explain why this has come about.

First of all, let us look at what is happening with the SDI program in the United States itself, since all this is taken into account when our position is changing or being formed. First, the initial popularity of SDI among Americans can be explained by the fact that it was made out to be a program for developing [sozdaniye] a total defense against nuclear missiles. It gradually became clear in any event that this so-called umbrella is full of holes. In the foreseeable future, all that can be envisioned is creating an antimissile defense with limited effectiveness, and, what is more, chiefly for defending military installations. Support for SDI and its prestige are therefore declining sharply in the United States. Second, SDI is now being subjected in the United States to the fettering influence of the positive processes of Soviet-U.S. relations. For

instance, the U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK recently wrote: In conditions when the Russians are proposing a substantial reduction in nuclear weapons, a public which is already not overjoyed might demand that the next president renounce SDI.

Third, certain changes have been registered in the attitude toward SDI in the inner regions of the U.S. military-industrial complex itself. Stepping up work on SDI, in particular, the transition to deploying it in space, will need between $15 and 20 billion and more to be earmarked for this purpose every year, according to the calculations of U.S. specialists. The U.S. economic difficulties—the over-saturation, I would say, of the military budget—essentially leave no room to finance new military programs, unless there is a substantial cut in other items of the Pentagon's military budget.

Fourth, the Soviet Union's reaction to SDI was a disappointment to the U.S. military-political leadership. One of the aims of this program was to exhaust the Soviet Union economically—that is, the desire was to compel the USSR to allocate huge sums on space weapons. The U.S. Administration was clearly counting on the inertia of Soviet political thinking, on the aspiration which was long current in our country to catch up with the United States in the military sphere, copying its innovations. Here, however, Washington underestimated the changes which are taking place in the Soviet Union and failed to take into account the dynamism and flexibility which have emerged in our country in such a sensitive sphere as the military-political sphere. Our country's response turned out to be wholly unexpected for the United States: The Soviet leadership declared that countermeasures to SDI would consist not in building our own SDI; they would be assymmetrical, far simpler and cheaper.

On our part, too, I think, there was also a clear overestimation of the potential and the danger of SDI, and an equally clear overestimation of the Soviet Union's potential to compel the U.S. Administration to renounce this program. I think it is an illusion to proceed from the idea that it is easy to do away with SDI. But in real politics, you cannot take what is desired to be reality. The policy of continuing work on SDI is being nurtured by fairly powerful interests in the United States, and it would be a mistake not to take into account these interests. At the same time, it is obvious that that a lot of the research which comes under the SDI program in the United States does not in all cases contract the ABM Treaty. For example, the creation [sozdaniye] of powerful computer software, the development of new technology aimed at securing the invulnerability of satellites and at sharply cutting the expenditure needed to put large payloads into orbit—all this relates to areas to which the restrictions of the ABM treaty do not extend. So, all this enables us not to insist today on a total end to the SDI program. For instance, restrictions could be introduced which would permit even certain tests to be carried out, in order to provide answers to fundamental scientific questions, but only as long as all the propositions of the ABM Treaty are observed.

In other words, a political line is possible which makes it possible, without putting forward unrealistic bans on scientific research and development, including space research and development, to ensure accord on a fundamental cut in strategic offensive weapons. It is this logic which now determines our position on the ABM Treaty and the SDI program. The main thing in this position, I would say, is that the SDI program should cease to be an obstacle to an agreement on nuclear disarmament.

[Ptashnikov] But surely the dangerous role of SDI will not be eliminated if such an approach is adopted?

[Chernyshev] Of course not! If the United States succeeds in accomplishing its intentions regarding SDI—although, I reiterate, there are strong doubts about this—there will be a transfer of weapons into anew sphere, into space. This will acutely destabilize the strategic situation. It is precisely because of this that the Soviet Union envisions, in the documents relating to a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons, a very important obligation on the part of both sides. On the Soviet Union's initiative, the joint Soviet-U.S. summit declaration adopted in Washington records an agreement that intensive discussion of strategic stability will begin within 3 years of the end of the agreed period for nonviolation of the ABM Treaty; furthermore, after this period, if the sides do not come to any other agreement, each of them will have the right to determine its own form of action. [passage omitted on Andrianov, Surguchev, (Modayev) remarks]

Further Reportage on Interaction Council Session

Demichev Addresses Meeting

PM2005110388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 May 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "On the Threshold of the Next Century"]

[Excerpt] The international public's desire for peace and security and for the development of broad economic cooperation is a characteristic sign of our time. Ways to achieve these ends are being discussed at the sixth Interaction Council session, which opened in Moscow on 17 May. Its participants are representatives of this independent nongovernmental international organization uniting former heads of state and government of many countries and politicians famous in the past and today.

They were welcomed on the Soviet leadership's behalf by P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

We are pleased that this time you have chosen Moscow, our motherland's capital, as the venue for your latest session, he said.

Mankind has experienced the horrors and destruction of two world wars in the 20th century. An international organization was set up to ensure universal security and prevent new military conflicts—the United Nations, whose mechanisms have been activated to strengthen the peoples' peaceful cooperation. The entire world community recognizes today that the conflagration of a new world war, particularly a nuclear missile war, must be avoided at all costs.

Qualitatively new objective realities have emerged in the modern world, which no one can ignore. They insistently dictate to all peoples and states the need to formulate common positions. The task is finding a balance of diverse interests with due regard to the pluralism of the modern world. This objective logic of actual reality contains the roots of the new political thinking opening up the way to a nuclear-free, nonviolent world.

Proceeding from a comprehensive analysis and interpretation of the contemporary international situation, the Soviet leadership has drawn far-reaching conclusions and formulated new approaches to resolving very acute world problems. Evidence of this is provided by M.S. Gorbachev's statement of 15 January 1986. All the Soviet Union's subsequent initiatives, proposals, and practical steps confirm that our state is purposefully and consistently pursuing the new course.

Our new course of international activity is already yielding fruit. I have in mind, above all, the signing of the USSR-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. We regard the conclusion of this treaty as a result of the efforts of many politicians and public figures and various states.

The halting of the arms race and real disarmament are, from our viewpoint, at the same time also a very important condition for normalizing the economic and social development of all peoples.

In the postwar period, mankind has faced a strange paradox in its development. On the one hand, the possibilities of solutions to seemingly very complex socioeconomic problems have increased tremendously. The rapid development of science and technology combined with people's creative energy and businesslike initiative make it possible to augment the peoples' wealth, enhance the well-being of the broad masses, and ensure a fitting life for them. On the other hand, we are observing a widening gap between levels of development, many countries are being stifled by the excessive burden of a debt of more than 1 trillion [currency not specified], and there are deepening social contradictions associated with economic backwardness, hunger, disease, and poverty. Mankind is faced with global ecological problems and with seeking new sources of energy, raw materials, and a whole number of other problems.

Of course, every country's people seeks to mobilize, above all, its own internal resources and potential. There are both successes and failures here. But, at the same time, it is prefectly clear that many countries are not capable of resolving vitally important problems on their own.

Restructuring, which is being carried out over a wide front in our society, is opening up fundamentally new opportunities for mutually advantageous multilateral cooperation in the economic, scientific, technical, trade, and cultural spheres. We have advanced corresponding proposals. We have gained many foreign partners, who are holding businesslike talks with us, and there are already real results.

Of course, restructuring has been brought about, above all, by the requirements of our internal development. It includes a radical economic reform, which is called upon to commission the potential enshrined in the socialist society. All the transformations being implemented in our country are aimed at developing the initiative of the person and of labor collectives, enhancing their independence, and making active use of economic methods of management. The very first steps of the reform show that we are on the right road, and this has become obvious to our entire people.

At the same time, restructuring means a qualitatively new level of socialist democracy and glasnost. Without this, we cannot conceive of the people's active involvement in resolving questions of public and state life.

The ensuring of freedom of the individual and its social protection are important components of restructuring. Concern for human rights also permeates activity in shaping a secure and nonviolent world.

U.S. President R. Reagan will soon visit the Soviet Union. The results of the visit will be of great significance for the evolving trends of world development. Of course, the process of ratifying the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is having an influence on the atmosphere at the upcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting. The world's peoples are waiting for this process to be concluded. We reckon that the new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting will bring us considerably closer to a reduction in strategic offensive arms. At the same time, we believe that the Interaction Council's recommendation to comply strictly with the provisions of the ABM Treaty and to take all necessary measures to prevent an arms race in space must also be implemented. We hope that U.S. President Reagan's visit will end with weighty positive results.

The speaker wished the session participants success in their work. [passage omitted]

Demichev, Romania's Manescu Meet

AU1805181088 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1739 GMT 18 May 88

[Text] Moscow, AGERPRES, 18/5/1988—Manea Manescu, vice-president of Romania's State Council, now participating in the 6th session of the Interaction Council, met P.N. Demichev, first vice-chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, in Moscow.

The sides evoked the ascending evolution of the Romanian-Soviet relations of friendship and collaboration, and approached questions related to the development and diversification of the economic relations, of the cooperation in production as well as in technology and science.

Japan's Fukuda Speaks

OW1905130188 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 18 May 88

[Text] Takeo Fukuda, former prime minister of Japan, has delivered a speech at the sixth Interaction Council session held in the Trade Union Hall in Moscow on 17 May.

In his speech Fukuda stated: It is of great interest that the Interaction Council session is being held in Moscow at this juncture when the USSR-U.S. summit, an event of top priority for the future of mankind, is close at hand. East-West relations, which have begun to improve, should not be allowed to slip back. To those who attempt to turn the clock the wrong way, we would like to say that history has already witnessed too many mistakes, and that mistakes should no longer be repeated.

The 83-year-old ex-prime minister is a virtual eyewitness of world history from the beginning of the 20th century, which included World War I, the great depression of the 1930's, World War II, and the arms race. He continued: World attention is now focused on the upcoming summit in Moscow. It is sincerely hoped that the two leaders will overcome differences in ideology and social system and show true courage. Mankind has lived in the cold war environment for as long as 40 years. We must see to it that the 40 years become a page of the world history and are never repeated.

FRG's Schmidt Holds Briefing

LD1905195888 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 19 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS—Moscow is the world's most interesting capital today and we are grateful for an opportunity to hold a session of our organisation here, Helmut Schmidt, chairman of the Interaction Council, former federal chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, said here today. He spoke in the Press Center of the Soviet Foreign Ministry at a meeting with journalists devoted to the outcome of the sixth session of this international organisation. It groups about 30 former heads of state and government, prominent politicians and public figures.

The session discussed three sets of problems: ecological, matters of global economic development and the international political situation at the threshold of the 21st century.

Interest in the Soviet capital as the venue of the session was generated by the processes of restructuring and greater openness taking place in the USSR now, Schmidt said. On the other hand, the eyes of all the world's nations are on Moscow now because East-West relations entered the second phase of detente. This is confirmed by regular contacts between the top leaders of the USSR and the United States, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting which is to take place late in May.

People around the world look forward with impatience to the meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, the former West German chancellor furthermore said. Top-level meetings offer a good opportunity to discuss candidly and in detail the existing problems, to relieve tension in relations between the two superpowers.

A final statement adopted by the sixth session of the Interaction Council was released at the press conference. It says, in part, that the prospect for a 50 per cent

reduction in strategic offensive armaments by the Soviet Union and the United States should prompt other nuclear powers to join this process.

At the same time, the statement says, relations between the East and the West should not be limited to arms control problems solely but develop on a stable basis. A good example of this is the settlement of the Afghan problem, which has a positive impact on relations between the two major powers.

In the document the participants in the session declared for revising the existing international economic order on a just footing and against protectionism in world trade. They put special emphasis on the discussion of the issue of solving fundamentally the problem of the developing countries' high indebtedness.

This outstanding problem can exert a catastrophic influence on the international financial system, spurt up a further increase in instability and poverty in under developed countries, the statement says. It also underscores the need for cooperation and collaborative efforts of all countries in revamping the developing countries' economy.

Takeo Fukuda, former prime minister of Japan, and Olusegun Obasanjo, former head of the federal military government of Nigeria, also answered questions put by journalists.

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'
LD2205180088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 22 May 88

["International Observers Roundtable" program with observers Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin and Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobysh and commentator Vyacheslav Georgiyevich Lavrentyev]

[Text] [Lavrentyev] There are fewer and fewer days before the fourth Soviet-U.S. summit. In the time since the first meeting in Geneva, both sides have done much, both on widening bilateral relations and on working out joint approaches to solving international problems. I would like us now to analyze the development of Soviet-U.S. relations between those two meetings.

[Shishlin] Well, first of all, I would like to invite listeners to closely study an interview in tomorrow's PRAVDA given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the U.S. newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST and the magazine NEWSWEEK. There they will find a balanced and exact assessment of what is in store for us, of the significance of this point in time, and also of the political distance that has been covered in Soviet-U.S. relations.

One of the things Mikhail Sergeyevich says in that interview is that the winds of confrontation that have been determining the state of Soviet-U.S. affairs are now giving way to the winds of hope; that, of course, the Soviet-U.S. dialogue has become a constant element, a constant quantity, in international relations as such. If we take into account the fact that in international relations a certain process of restructuring has begun to occur on the basis of those realities that are a feature of our time, on the basis of the new political thinking—if we take this into account, then it goes without saying that the Moscow meeting is significant in the highest degree.

I will not attempt to speak concretely and specifically now about the results that will be obtained in Moscow, but one thing that is already beyond doubt is that this fourth meeting in a little over 2 and 1/2 years is an indication of the intensiveness of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, and of the fact that, most certainly, that dialogue is acquiring new qualities.

Well, Vitaliy Ivanovich remembers very well the Geneva meeting in the fall of 1985 and the principled conclusion that was drawn by the leaders of our two states.

[Kobysh] But before that, Nikolay Vladimirovich, there had been tension; there had been the striving to understand one another because we just did not know how all this would turn out. And what happened at the beginning was that we simply got to know each other...

[Shishlin, interrupting] Well, yes, but...

[Kobysh continues] ...And found a common language.

[Shishlin] Yes, but I think possibly it is a bit too soon to speak of a common language. A common language is just what was not found. But a principled conclusion certainly was drawn at Geneva: that nuclear war is unthinkable, that in a nuclear war there can be no victors, that nuclear war—and conventional war for that matter—quite simply must not happen. That was the fundamental conclusion of Geneva. What you are saying about the tension, alienation, and simple, elemental hostility that characterized the state of Soviet-U.S. relations, is of course also a reality that has to be taken into account. And certain elements of it persist. We cannot say that with all the changes in Soviet-U.S. relations, a climate of trust and full mutual understanding has already been established. But we can say that the dialogue as such is acknowledged to be necessary, and that it is in no sense a dialogue of the deaf but is leading us toward definite decisions. This, too, of course is obvious. Here we cannot omit to say a good word for Reykjavik, which was indeed a real breakthrough, though initially many observers regarded Reykjavik and its results as some sort of failure. The optimistic note that was struck on that dramatic evening in Reykjavik in October 1986 by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has emerged as the only one which is justified. It was Reykjavik that led to the Washington results.

[Kobysh] Have you considered the fact that, for the first time, a Soviet leader will be having a fourth meeting with a U.S. President? Arithemtic is not the point. The point

is, rather, that a new time has come—a time that is not just intense but full of threatened danger. Quite simply, it is dangerous to live now without this constant dialogue. It is very encouraging that this mechanism has been, let us hope, to some extent developed.

There are various arguments about the forthcoming meeting. There is much discussion on the theme of whether the U.S. Senate will have ratified the INF Treaty by the time President Reagan arrives in Moscow. In general, that does not seem to me to be the crux of the matter. Most probably, the Senate will ratify it. It would be better if it did so by the time the U.S. President arrives in Moscow. But the important thing is that the treaty exists, and I am almost sure it will be ratified. It is hardly likely now that anyone will dare not to ratify it, to raise his voice—well, except perhaps for Jesse Helms and a few other really extreme ultra-rightwingers in the U.S. Senate.

This creates a new situation, both in the world and in the United States, and it is in this situation that the meeting will open. If during the meeting nothing majestic—of the kind that the press and the mass media have always wanted—is signed, that will not in the least mean that the meeting is carrying no political load. I think that any meeting between the President of the United States and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee is a very important event: Even if they sign nothing, they will be discussing matters of such seriousness that they will blaze a path to very important agreements in the future.

[Lavrentyev] It so happens that in one of his latest speeches, President Reagan sketched the four main topics that seem likely to be the subject of discussion in Moscow. They are: disarmament, bilateral relations, human rights, and regional conflicts. Can you perhaps tell us which of these are the most difficult from the point of view of achieving greater mutual understanding? And which are the problems during the discussion of which we can expect some breakthrough to impressive results?

[Shishlin] In his answers to questions from THE WASHINGTON POST and NEWSWEEK, Mikhail Sergeyevich rightly said: Be patient. It is only a few days now until the meeting. Let me and the President get down to work, and nothing will be kept secret. Everything will be made public and made available to the press.

That really is so—we have to be a little bit patient. But as far as the agenda itself is concerned, it was drawn up a long time ago, and you cannot say that one group of issues is easy to resolve while another is more difficult. I think, really, we need now to speak of something else and not speculate as to where there will or will not be a breakthrough. That is not the point. The point is that, in itself, the Soviet-U.S. dialogue really is now acquiring a certain productiveness. It is assuming a constructive character.

Questions of curbing the arms race will be discussed, yes. Of course. attention will center on the problem of limiting strategic offensive arms—a 50 percent reduction linked to the ABM Treaty. That much is certain.

Take the question of regional conflicts: An example is available of a new approach to settling regional conflicts; namely, the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan and the very fact of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country. Human rights issues: These, too, have been discussed before at Soviet-U.S. meetings, and I would say that actually these discussions are gradually entering a new plane—not of mutual accusations and counteraccusations but of searching for more rational and more constructive approaches.

After all, the Soviet Union is now doing an enormous amount to guarantee human rights in our own country, and advocates the granting of human rights in other countries. All that is being done within the framework of Soviet legislation. All that is being done to strengthen the USSR as a state with a strict rule of law, in which the law is paramount. All that is being done in the framework of the democratization policy, which will be the objective of the 19th party conference. All this indicates, not on the level of words, but on the level of deeds, how much attention our country is devoting to what is indeed a major problem, both national and international.

[Kobysh] All the same, one aspect of it is that we understand human rights in different ways. Certain things are essential: People must have jobs, somewhere to live, and medical care. People must be able to travel freely. People must have the right to feel safe and confident about the future. But that is our understanding of human rights. The American understanding is a little different. So on this issue, final harmony is a long way off.

As for Soviet-U.S. relations, here the progress is plain to see. In the last 2-3 years, there has been simply a great change, or, if you like, a breakthrough, in all areas. In the political sphere, in the sphere of diplomacy. Now things are starting to move in the economic sphere, too. The fact that we have a Boeing-747 flying to Moscow regularly twice a week is in some sense quite a significant first swallow that does make a spring.

[Shishlin] But as yet, the actual content of Soviet-U.S. business cooperation is very meager. That must be said plainly, especially in the economic sphere.

[Kobysh] Nevertheless, I do think there are quite a few encouraging elements. Just recently, the University of Delaware held a poll among 238 U.S. companies. The question was: How do you see the Soviet Union as a trading partner? Most of them—87 percent—gave the Soviet Union very high marks as a trading partner.

[Shishlin] All that is at the level of intentions. You know, there have been many similar assessments. But so far, it has been a revolution on the level of words and on the level of intentions. But if you look at the number of deals, the number of actual contracts, you will find the number is quite wretchedly small, and in this respect, there is no room for any sort of complacency. We still have the Jackson-Vanik Amendment which discriminates against the Soviet Union. As you know, the Soviet Union does not have the right to most-favored nation status in trade relations with the United States. Clearly, that is a pretty serious limitation, to say nothing of the restrictive Cocom lists of science-intensive products and high technology. So I do not think the breakthrough you are talking about will happen quickly.

[Kobysh] I did not mean in the economic sphere. But as for economics, when you criticize the United States, Nikolay Vladimirovich, I would also criticize, in this case, Soviet foreign trade organizations. I have been directly concerned with these matters for many years, and I have to tell you that for our part, the work was not done as well as it might have been—to put it mildly. Doing business with us was always unreliable and sometimes risky. There were red tape and bureaucratic impediments to contend with, so they just did not feel like dealing with such a partner. So let us criticize ourselves a little bit. Now, in the course of our restructuring, we also have to make a few changes in this respect. It would not do to blame the Americans for everything.

[Lavrentyev] Well, you see how abruptly things can change! The sternest critic of the United States, Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobysh, is suddenly directing the arrows of his criticism at another target and shielding the United States!

[Kobysh] I am not shielding them. I just want us to speak, in the present instance, objectively and level-headedly and have a clear field for cooperation so that nothing hinders our cooperation. I believe profoundly that, as the University of Delaware poll showed, the Americans do see us as a trading partner.

[Lavrentyev] Incidentally, THE NEW YORK TIMES report says outright that the Russians received the highest assessment for reliability. Only five companies found that the terms of their agreements were not fulfilled, and what is more, only two of them put this down to inefficiency rather than malice. [sentence as heard]

[Kobysh] No, of course there is never any malice. There is always, for some reason, lack of time for answering a business letter. One has not got a stamp handy, or the mail is out of action. In the United States, all this is calculated down to the last second.

[Lavrentyev] You know, time is getting on, and I suggest we get back to direct discussion of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting.

[Shishlin] From my point of view, the most important thing in this meeting is to keep the flame of Soviet-U.S. dialogue burning. It is an opportunity to pass the baton on to the administration which replaces the the current one, an opportunity to prevent any kind of pause due to the U.S. domestic political situation—the United State is currently involved in its regular presidential elections. So that is what I consider to be most important. As for practical results, and on this I agree completely with Vitaliy Ivanovich, even if they are modest at first glance, their political worth will be none the less for it.

[Lavrentyev] But nobody knows what modest or not-very-modest results are. When we observed that dramatic evening in Reykjavik, at the end of the meeting, it seemed as if there had been a disaster, as if something incredible had occurred. Everyone has such a tragic expression: Mikhail Sergeyevich, a man of smiling disposition, had to force a smile while Reagan, the professional actor, could not manage one. That is how difficult it all was! But it turned out that it had all cleared the way toward the Washington agreement. There is no such thing as talks between the U.S. President and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee which produce no results. Even the very fact that they have exchanged views is extremely important. You mentioned regional problems: I would very much like them to discuss the Afghanistan issue now. To me, the United States is fulfilling the Geneva Afghanistan agreements in a very strange way because Pakistan has begun supplying the mujahidin with heavy arms to storm Kabul, and the mujahidin are behaving extremely aggressively—none of which would be happening without Pakistan and the United States. It is now clear to everyone orchestrating this who is behind it.

[Shishlin] If we are going to discuss this, then let us mention both sides of the matter. For after all, the most fundamental fact in the Afghan situation today is that the Geneva agreements have begun to be put into action and that our units are returning home. Undoubtedly, the political situation in Afghanistan itself remains complex, but I would not say that the final word here will go to the Peshawar Seven and their backers. There are very varied forces at work on the Afghan political scene: There is the legitimate government in Kabul; indeed, there is also the armed opposition represented not only by the above-mentioned seven but by various other armed detachments disloyal to the government; and there are conflicts both between these detachments and the Peshawar Seven and within the Peshawar Seven. It is a very mixed and complex picture, and I think it is, of course, quite justifiable to say that to a large extent the development of events in Afghanistan will depend on the scrupulous, precise, and complete fulfillment of the Geneva agreements by all countries that signed them—that is, by the Soviet Union and the United States as guarantors of the agreements, and by Afghanistan and Pakistan...and indeed all other aspects of the agreements. I think that today, at least, we are justified in saying that the Geneva decisions themselves and the actual practice of their

implementation have the most fundamental significance for the overall state of international relations. They are undoubtedly contributing to raising the Soviet Union's international prestige and are setting, on the whole, a good example of a political approach to settling a very acute and very complex problem. [Lavrentyev] That is true, and in this connection, just imagining the possible dialogue between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President, I assume that their discussion might move on to the subject of other regions: southern Africa, let us say, or Central America.

[Kobysh] If we take the problems of Central America, there has been a process there running in parallel to the solving of the Afghan problem, and, on the whole, they have made a fair amount of progress. We know about the Guatemala agreement and about the wishes of practically the whole of Latin America, which has supported the efforts of the five Central American countries. On the whole, the process is going on quite intensively. According to the latest reports, the Sandinist government and representatives of the contras have finally agreed after all to have a fourth meeting. Despite powerful opposition from Washington, which is doing all it can to try to hamper the peace settlement process in Nicaragua, the process is continuing. There are guarantors there, who are actively supporting the process....

[Shishlin, interrupting] You mean the Contadora and the Contadora Support Group?

[Kobysh] Yes, and now they are even known as the eight—eight politically very influential Latin American countries which are actively supporting that process. They have been joined by Canada, Spain, the countries...

[Shishlin, interrupting] And France.

[Kobysh continues] ...And France. Virtually all EEC countries.

[Lavrentyev] If, as you correctly noted, this process is moving in a positive direction, then it is not because of Washington but despite Washington, which is against the process. To be honest, I do not really understand their logic. What is it that they are against? There is a normal historical process under way there. For more than 40 years, Nicaragua was ruled by a gang of criminals, the Somozists, who were Washington's puppet dictatorship. They were overthrown by the people, but instead of joining up with the people and helping them to build a new life, Washington began promoting aggression against the new authorities, against revolutionary Nicaragua. From the point of view of political logic, it is a fairly absurd situation, a dead-end situation.

[Kobysh] Well, that more or less deals with that problem, but there is another very acute conflict right next door in another Central American republic, Panama. For almost a year now, the United States has been trying to remove the commander in chief of the National Defense Forces, General Noriega, from power.

[Lavrentyev] This indeed confirms that in its Central American policy, the United States is generally guided not by any well thought-out political aims or guidelines, nor even by ideological aims, but by the old imperialist habits. What they are now doing to Panama is pure imperialism.

In January 1964, when U.S. soldiers fired on a demonstration by young Panamanians, I went there right away. I was working in Latin America and only managed to get there in time to see the graves of the dead kids. What did they shoot them for? Because they went out into the street and chanted: The canal is ours. The canal belongs to Panama.

The United States was forced—and that was in Carter's time—to sign an agreement according to which it should, by the year 2000, hand over the canal to Panama, to the country through which it passes, to which it belongs. Now a war has begun against Noriega, but it is not against Noriega. It makes no difference whether Noriega was an agent in the pay of the CIA, whether he was a drug trafficker, or whether he was taking bribes. It is of no significance at all. What is of significance is that the United States does not want to honor the agrement, it does not wish to give up the canal. This is what the whole story is about.

[Shishlin] I think that, in talking about these problems, we should nevertheless not allow ourselves to be distracted from what is on the agenda today. Each point deserves attention: Panama, Nicaragua, everything is important; all are equally important. The importance of events is not determined by the territory or the size of the population of one country or another. But I would all the same like to return to the subject we started our discussion with today and to return to those thoughts which are expounded in the replies given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to correspondents from THE WASHINGTON POST and NEWSWEEK. I think that those thoughts that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev expresses on this turning point in people's way of thinking, this turning point in the development of international relations, this imperious need for a radical improvement of international relations that is forging a way for itself—there are what is most important, what is most essential. Naturally, there will be many problems. The meeting in Moscow will not solve those many problems. But it will be yet another step along the path chosen by our state, chosen by our party, along the path of really strengthening peaceful cooperation in this interconnected, contradictory but nonetheless integral world.

[Lavrentyev] Well, our time is up. Thank you for taking part in the program. Goodbye, comrades.

United States & Canada

Gorbachev Interview With U.S. Press Reported

PM2205174188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 88 First Edition pp 1,2

[Interview with CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev under the general heading: "M.S. Gorbachev Replies to Questions by THE WASHINGTON POST Newspaper and NEWSWEEK Magazine"]

[Text] Question: Have the three meetings with President Reagan changed your ideas as to how peaceful competition between capitalist and socialist countries should be regulated in the future? How do you think the forthcoming summit will contribute to stabilizing that competition?

Answer: I am convinced that positive trends are unfolding in the world. There is a turn from confrontation to coexistence. The winds of the cold war are being replaced by the winds of hope. And I see that a significant role in that process is played by the signs of improvement in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. All over the world there is an acute need for change or, if you wish, a need for restructuring international relations. In that situation it is extremely important to continue positive contacts between East and West.

As for the dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union, it is simply vital because of the great role they play in today's world.

The very fact that this dialogue exists is effective, not to mention its content with such exceptionally important joint statements as those regarding the inadmissibility of wars, nuclear or any other, the necessity of resolving problems by political means and of recognizing the realities of today's world.

It is very important that all this has sounded loud and clear for the whole world to hear, and we have seen how the world has responded to it. All this leads to the following conclusion: Yes, we are different and will remain so. We will remain loyal to our ideas and our way of life. But we have a common responsibility, especially our two great powers, and our every action must measure up to that responsibility.

As for the potential results of the upcoming fourth meeting with the President and, notably, the prospects for a detailed agreement on a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons, the past few months and weeks have seen so much speculation that I would like to make the following point: Be patient, the meeting is just a few days away, let the President and me work together. Whatever we arrive at will certainly not be concealed from the public.

There are two more points to be made here, though. The very continuation of the Soviet-American dialogue at the summit level is important and substantive. In any case, I hope our attention will be focused on the main international problems like at the previous meetings and that we will be able to rise to a new level of dialogue and mutual understanding.

And next, if an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons comes to be drafted under the present U.S. Administration, I see no reason why President Reagan and I should not sign it. I would certainly welcome that.

Question: Many people in the West think that nuclear weapons have been instrumental in maintaining stability in the world over the past few decades. Would it not be more rational for the USSR and the U.S. in those conditions to agree on preserving minimal nuclear deterrents?

Answer: I cannot agree with those who think that the drive for a nuclear-free world is hopeless.

I have argued more than once with representatives of the West over their case that without nuclear weapons we would never have survived for 40 years without another world war. This is just a conjecture. But what about a sober evaluation of the real role played by the so-called "balance of fear"? It has given us nothing but unheard-of militarization of foreign policies, economies, and even intellectual life. It has caused damage in the sphere of international morality and ethics and has killed the atmosphere of mutual trust, friendliness, and sincere interest in each other which was born in Soviet-American relations in the years of joint warfare and victory over fascism.

I am convinced that strategic military parity can be maintained at a low level and without nuclear weapons. We have clearly formulated our choice: to stop, then reverse the arms race.

As for the so-called "minimal nuclear deterrence," I will not argue now with the proponents of that idea. So far, you and we have more than 10,000 warheads each in our strategic arsenals. Let us first cut them by 50 percent. Maybe then by another 50 percent and then once again. In the meantime, let us come to terms on the elimination of chemical weapons and start reducing conventional armaments in Europe. That process should be open not only for the U.S. and the USSR but for all other nuclear and non-nuclear states. That will be an important incentive for the demilitarization of politics, ways of thinking, and international relations in general.

And, another point: If we start orienting ourselves on a "minimal nuclear deterrence" now, I assure you that nuclear weapons will start spreading around the world, devaluing and undermining even what we can achieve at Soviet-American talks and at the negotiations among the now existing nuclear states.

A peaceful future for mankind can be guaranteed not by "nuclear deterrence," but by a balance of reason and goodwill and by a system of comprehensive security.

Question: The NATO leaders have announced that even with a balance in the conventional forces in Europe, nuclear weapons will still need to be preserved on the continent as a means of retaliation. If, in keeping with that position, nuclear disarmament is unacceptable for the West, should we not try to reach a joint agreement on the terms of modernization of the tactical nuclear weapons deployed in Europe?

Answer: The talk about nuclear weapons on the continent as a means of retaliation is the same old concept of a "limited" nuclear war in Europe. It absolutely contradicts what I conferred with the U.S. President about back in Geneva—notably, that nuclear war cannot be won and simply must not be allowed to happen. Can you really not see that materialization of the formula of modernizing tactical nuclear weapons in Europe is fraught with the danger of a nuclear catastrophe in the center of the continent?

I know of the NATO statements concerning nuclear weapons. But I also know that people are thinking not only at NATO headquarters, but also in public, scientific, and government circles. There are already a number of ideas which have authoritative supporters both in the east and west of Europe—on ways of reducing conventional armaments, including dual-purpose systems, from the Atlantic to the Urals. We support the ideas of nuclear-free zones in Northern Europe and in the Balkans. We are also in favour of a 300-kilometer corridor free of all nuclear and any other heavy weapons in Central Europe. I am naming just some ideas but certainly not all.

I am positive that it is here, in such intermediate projects, that we should seek ways of removing the threat of nuclear war, instead of clinging to nuclear weapons which do not lead to genuine security in any "option." The ideas that you mention in your question are self-delusion.

As for "deterrence," isn't awareness of the very fact that a strike at nuclear power stations and chemical plants even with conventional weapons would be lethal for densely-populated Europe enough of a deterrent to war?

Question: The NATO countries suggested to the Warsaw Pact states cutting tens of thousands of non-nuclear weapons that could be used for surprise or large-scale offensive operations. Does this approach fall within the boundaries of your stated willingness to negotiate on the basis of asymmetrical reductions?

Answer: On our side, there are no obstacles to that. As for the existing asymmetries in the arsenals of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, I have already expressed my views on that score many times: Asymmetries exist on both sides. We stand for eliminating the asymmetry on the basis of reciprocity. For example, the Warsaw Treaty armies have more tanks, and the NATO armies have more attack planes. The Soviet Union and our allies are ready to eliminate these and other asymmetries without delay but, let me repeat, on the basis of reciprocity. And then it would be possible to balance armaments on the lowest possible level sufficient only for defense.

We are not satisfied with the pace of the Vienna consultations of the 23 countries elaborating the mandate of the future conference. If the work in Vienna proceeds in the same on-again off-again manner, Europe will have to wait for a long time before those asymmetries are eliminated.

Quite possibly—I would even say certainly—there are people whom such a situation suits just fine. But I believe that they will be unable to adhere to their positions for long. The forces realizing the inevitability of a solution to the question of dangerous armed confrontation on the European continent are becoming stronger.

Question: In the months remaining of the Reagan Presidency, what should be undertaken to ensure that your personal relations with the President are elevated to the level of interstate relations and become a norm for the future?

Answer: The experience of present-day international relations shows the paramount importance of meetings between the leaders of states, all the more so, when the case in point is the United States and the Soviet Union. Since both countries are well aware of the need for intensifying the dialogue and improving relations, it is absolutely obvious that it is not only the leaders' personal views that matter. This is the imperative of our time. This is the striving of our peoples. Such is the constant in the Soviet-American dialogue. It remains intact. And if we add to that the experience we have accumulated, all these factors taken together give rise to hopes for continuity and even for intensified contacts and improved mutual understanding. However, let me repeat that everything rests on the interests of our countries and peoples, not on the sentiments of individual political figures or their personal motives. No one can allow relations to slide to a point beyond which the unpredictable may happen. Such is the basis for continuing and developing the Soviet-American dialogue. It will remain the same in the future as well.

In a word, we are interested in developing the dialogue, we will strive to make it more productive, we will try to facilitate the "adaptation" of the next U.S. Administration's contacts with us, and will do everything within our power to keep the process begun in Geneva in 1985 from stopping. And, naturally enough, we hope for the same attitude on the American side.

Question: Do you feel President Reagan is a different kind of American leader? Which of his qualities and/or ideas would you most hope to see his successor hold as well? Has he been able to persuade you that the military-industrial complex does not determine U.S. policy?

Answer: As is known, I made President Reagan's acquaintance in Geneva less than 3 years ago. We have maintained contacts in various forms ever since. There were three one-on-one meetings. The fourth is approaching.

I'm not particularly fond of giving personal character references. But since you ask, I would like to say that realism is an important quality in President Reagan as a politician. By this I mean the ability to adapt one's views to the changing situation, while remaining faithful to one's convictions. Who would have thought in the early 1980's, both in the Soviet Union and the United States, that it would be President Reagan who would sign with us the first nuclear arms reduction agreement in history? However, the sober-minded realization that the world has changed and that the interests of our countries are changing enabled the President to take a fresh look at the existing realities, while holding to his well-known convictions. And don't the leaders of such powers as the USSR and the United States, which bear a unique responsibility for the destiny of the modern-day world, really need such qualities as the ability to give up dogmas and discard outdated ideas for the sake of making progress? For the goal in question is most noble—ridding our peoples and all humanity of the nuclear nightmare, building new relations, and improving the international situation.

As for the military-industrial complex, let me remind you that it wasn't us, it was one of the predecessors of the current President, Dwight Eisenhower, also a Republican, who came up with that notion.

It seems unlikely that he made a mistake. But is that complex the only force shaping American policy? Hardly so, although, let me repeat, its infuence is substantial. And it makes itself felt especially obviously and candidly whenever there are signs of positive change in the disarmament sphere, whenever there are prospects for reaching agreements in that field, and whenever Congress is about to consider military budgets and other allocations for armaments.

But, to quote the ancient Greek philosophers, all is in a state of flux, nothing stays still. If the process of disarmament proceeds actively, if corporations receive fewer military-related orders and if the U.S. stops wielding a "big stick" every time something happens tens of thousands of kilometers away from the U.S.—something pictured as a threat to America's national interests—then we will be able to discuss that matter again.

Question: The Americans are familiar with the rapid erosion that occurred in the situation in Vietnam once they decided to withdraw from that war. What changes, in your view, will take place in Afghanistan in the next year while the Soviet Union is pulling out its troops? What will the Soviet Unions's contribution to bringing about those changes be?

Answer: Any parallel between Vietnam and Afghanistan is artificial. Not to mention how different the nature of the conflicts is. I would only like to remind you of the fact that prior to the Americans pulling out of Vietnam, that country was divided for 20 years into two nearly equal parts by a border along the 17th parallel. In both sections, there existed governments personifying regimes opposite in nature and incompatible in aim.

There is nothing of the kind in Afghanistan. On the contrary, the government there has set itself the goal of achieving the Afghan people's national reconciliation and, on this basis, its own reorganization into a coalition government with the participation of all parties to the conflict.

It goes without saying that the future depends in many respects on how honestly and consistently all the signatories to the Geneva agreements will meet the commitments assumed, without trying to get around them in some way or another or deceive their partners.

I can reaffirm once again that the Soviet Union intends to meet its obligations precisely and undeviatingly.

It is the Afghans themselves who are to decide how the settlement will proceed, what changes are to take place in Afghanistan in the future. We adhere firmly to this principle, which means non-interference in internal affairs. The Soviet Union will render assistance to Afghanistan in dealing with the consequences of the war, in strengthening the Afghan economy. In a word, it will act in keeping with the long-standing traditions of good-neighborliness and friendship with this southern neighbor of ours, undoubtedly, respecting its status as an independent, neutral, and nonaligned state.

Question: You said that when the Afghan knot is untied, it will have the most profound impact on other regional conflicts too. Is the Soviet Union prepared to cooperate with the United States and other countries in resolving other conflicts, for example in Central America, the Persian Gulf, and Angola?

Answer: Yes, it is prepared. I have already said that, given constructive cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States and major emphasis on the prestige and capabilities of the United Nations, its Security Council and other bodies, political settlement of regional conflicts and prevention of new ones will gradually become an international practice, a norm. I would like to confirm this conviction of mine.

The world has ample proof that dragged-out conflicts are the result of politics being exposed to pressure from outdated stereotypes. These stereotypes are well known: traditional approaches toward ensuring national security, with power politics being preferred to sober considerations and political boldness, the old habit of seeking to satisfy one's rights and interests at other people's expense, and a shortage of fairness and humanness in international relations.

The President and I have discussed this more than once and we will have a chance to take up these matters at the forthcoming meeting too. Of course, such a talk can be productive only if there is respect for the right of every people to choose their own road.

Question: Recalling her talks with you, Mrs Thatcher drew a comparison between the criticism and resistance a Western leader faces in bringing change and what you have encountered in pushing perestroyka and glasnost. She wished you success. Is the comparison accurate? Or is it fundamentally different? To be more specific, by glasnost you seem to mean something quite different from what we think of as freedom of speech. Could you elaborate on the differences?

Answer: I appreciate the kind words Mrs Thatcher addresses to us now and then. However, I cannot help saying that I disagree with her views on ways to preserve peace, her dedication to nuclear deterrence and her assessments of socialism.

About the similarities and dissimilarities of economic policy in this country and in the West: Of course, it is possible to find a likeness, formal at last, in anything and such a likeness does exist if you do not go into the essence of one reform or another. However, it is the difference of principle that matters. What is taking place in the USSR is an all-embracing process of revolutionary renovation of socialist society on the basis of the historic choice which we do not doubt and which proved in principle the only correct one for our people 70 years ago. Otherwise the country with which you are discussing things that affect the future of the world as a whole would not exist. Of course, combatting stagnation in the course of perestroyka and dismantling the mechanism of retardation require that sluggishness and conservatism be overcome. Sometimes we are confronted with hectic impatience. There is also conscious resistance on the part of those whose narrow selfish interests are incompatible with perestroyka—socially, economically, or morally.

However, this is precisely what we mean by perestroyka, in the course of which we want to renovate our society, upgrade it quality-wise. Perestroyka is proceeding in width and depth, encompassing all public groups and all our territory. Perestroyka is growing and gaining momentum.

As for glasnost, it and freedom of speech are, of course, interconnected. However, these are not identical things. I would put it this way: While freedom of speech is indispensable for glasnost, we see glasnost as a broader phenomenon. For us it is not just the right of every citizen to openly say what he or she thinks about all social and political questions, but also the duty of the ruling party and all bodies of authority and administration to adhere to the principle of openness in decision-making, be accountable for their actions, act on criticism, and consider advice and recommendations from the shopfloor, public organizations, and individuals.

Glasnost as we perceive it accentuates an environment allowing citizens to effectively participate in discussing all of the country's affairs, in elaborating and making decisions that affect the interests of all of us and in monitoring the implementation of these decisions.

Question: Could you discuss what ideas from abroad have had influence in the formation of your political and economic thinking and your mode of action? Conversely, what is the effect of glasnost and perestroyka in other socialist countries?

Answer: In my book on perestroyka published by Harper and Row, I wrote that our new political thinking is a result of our comprehension of the realities of the nuclear age, the fruit of deep and self-critical reflections on the past and present of our own country and of the surrounding world.

The new thinking took into account and absorbed the conclusions and demands of the Nonaligned Movement, of the public and of the scientific community, of the movements of physicians, scientists and ecologists, and of various anti-war organizations. We also take into consideration the experience of other socialist countries just as they take ours into account. The process of mutual enrichment with experience, in which no one tries to impose any models on others, is under way.

Yes, all of us really do understand our dependence on one another better and feel that we live in an interrelated world and that all of us are inseparable parts of the single present-day civilization.

Question: Judging by the President's statements, you disagree with him on human rights. At the same time, your dramatic decisions to free Andrey Sakharov and to ease the conditions of emigration for some Soviet Jews who desire to live abroad have attracted attention around the world. What further steps do you plan in this direction?

Answer: Our perestroyka, the main factor of which is creative effort, also includes doing away with all deformations of the past years, with everything that hampers manifestation of the humanitarian essence of socialism.

We know our problems and speak honestly and openly about them. The process of democratization does not bypass the sphere of human rights and liberties. We are enhancing the political and public status of the personality. Many issues have already been resolved within the framework of the democratic process, while others will be resolved as Soviet society changes qualitatively in the course of perestroyka. But that is our business. We are resolving these issues not because we want to play up to somebody or to please somebody, but because this meets the interests of our society, because perestroyka cannot be carried out without it, and, last but not least, because it is wanted by the Soviet people who have long outgrown the restrictions which they put up with in the past and which were to a certain extent an inevitable part of the unusual revolutionary development which we have gone through.

nce I said, and it seems to me, to an American: Please, show me a country that has no problems. Each country has problems of its own, human rights included. Of course, we are well-informed about the situation with political, social, economic, and other rights in the United States. We know well the achievements and problems, but also the flaws of American society. But we do not try to interfere in your home affairs, though we deem it right to express our views on the processes taking place in American society, on your administration's policy. But we do not want to make all this a reason for confrontation. We consider such an approach to be correct, fair, we see it as meeting the interests of Soviet-American relations and their future. I want to emphasize once again that we do not try to impose anything on the United States, but at the same time we rebuff attempts by any side to meddle in our affairs, no matter who tries to do so in your country.

Such is, in principle, our approach. At the same time, there are problems in the human rights sphere which require joint consideration. The mechanism of cooperation in that area has begun to take shape of late. Scientists, specialists, and public representatives have been widely drawn into it. Specific issues are analyzed at their meetings in a calm atmosphere and businesslike manner.

We also welcome the accord on setting up a permanent body on human rights with the participation of deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet and U.S. congressmen. It is the duty of legislators in both countries to show concern for observance of the citizens' rights.

We are prepared to go on acting in this spirit.

Taking advantage of this opportunity, I would like to say the following. As it seems to me, pragmatism, preparedness to seek new decisions if what has been tested does not work, is the Americans' forte. But they also have a trait—please, do not resent my frankness—which sometimes makes it difficult to deal with them. I mean their confidence that everything American is the best, while what others have is at least worse if not altogether bad and unfit for use. I am not talking about anti-communism, which has been implanted in the United States for decades, despite the fact that Albert Einstein called it "the greatest lie of the 20th century" many years ago.

For the sake of our mutual understanding, please, do not try to teach us to live according to American rules—it is altogether useless. And I repeat that, for our part, we do not intend to suggest our values to the Americans.

Let each side live in its own way, respecting each other's choice and voluntary exchanging the fruits of our labor in all the spheres of human activity.

I am sure that each nation, each people does not lose but, conversely, wins if it looks at itself critically and does not ignore others' experience, if it is open to understanding of and respect for a different culture, a different way of thinking, different customs, and lastly, a different political system, of course, if it is not terrorist, fascist, or dictatorial.

Question: Does your policy of perestroyka require fundamental changes in the way relations among Soviet nationalities are structured? Are there any new steps planned within the framework of this policy in conformity with the interests of cultural diversity and internationalism among nationalities?

Answer: The question of changing the socialist principles of relations among the nations and ethnic groups in our country is not on the agenda in the USSR. But we will set right the violations of these principles. It is such violations that caused the recent developments in some of our republics. The West has displayed, I would say, a morbid interest in them, not infrequently with anti-Soviet innuendo and bad intentions. It made lavish use of speculations aimed at weakening our multiethnic union.

Problems certainly do exist, and they are linked with the legacy we inherited from the time of the personality cult and the period of stagnation—in the economy, social policy, spiritual life, and human relations. Internationalism, which is deeply rooted in the hearts and minds of Soviet people of all nationalities will help us resolve the problems in this sphere, too. And we will resolve them in the spirit of perestroyka and in close linkage with the accomplishment of all the main tasks it involves, in the process of radical renewal of society.

Further on Interview

PM2205190988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 88 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "M.S. Gorbachev's Replies to Questions by THE WASHINGTON POST Newspaper and NEWSWEEK Magazine"]

[Text] As reported earlier, a conversation took place between M.S. Gorbachev and publishers of THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper and NEWSWEEK magazine.

M.S Gorbachev: I'm glad to greet you here in Moscow on the eve of the summit. What is the mood in Washington?

Katharine Graham: All are preparing for the summit. Thousands of people will come here in connection with this event. Everyone has great hopes and expectations.

Gorbachev: Moscow, too, is looking forward to the summit. That's good. It's good that the cause once started continues. The Soviet-American dialogue may have its ups and downs, it may have its evolution, but there's no doubt, that since it's proceeding, it promises specific results in the development of our relations. I stated this in the written answers to your questions, handed over to you. We estimate highly the very fact of constant Soviet-American dialogue. Contacts with the United States in different fields—political, scientific, technical, economic, and cultural—are diversified. And yet, they cannot replace summit meetings.

To this I can add and inform you that Moscow, too, lives in an atmosphere of preparations for a visit by a President of the United States after an interval of 14 years.

Graham: I would like to note that you, together with President Reagan and George Shultz and Eduard Shevardnadze, have created a new mechanism of fruitful discussions, something that was missing previously.

Gorbachev: I think it really is an important result of our joint work over the past few years. Of course, I highly rate specific agreements reached during these discussions, especially the INF Treaty. And yet, I believe that the most important political achievement is regular and systematic dialogue.

Well, it sounds like I'm beginning to question you..., to seize the initiative. But then I've already answered your written questions. Now we can just talk.

Graham: To begin with, I would like to thank you for your answers to our written questions. They mean a great deal to us and we are grateful to you for this and for the sincerity of your answers. Of course, in this conversation we would like to discuss very many things. Preparing for this meeting we talked with very many people and virtually everywhere we were told how many problems you are confronted with and how hard it will be to solve them. Many are just stunningly impressed by the audacity [derzost] of your plans. May I ask you, do you ever experience moments of doubt, when a task seems incredibly complicated and even unrealizable? Do you experience moments of hesitation?

Why do you think your program of reforms must be crowned with success, whereas the programs of such of your predecessors as Nikita Khrushchev were not and failed?

Gorbachev: Well, you've asked perhaps the most important question to which both our people and, I think, also the Americans would like to know the answer on account of the fact that, one way or another, whether we like it or not, it is the destiny of our two peoples and our two countries to cooperate and to learn to live together. And this, naturally, implies knowing each other, and, particularly, knowing each other's plans. They are truly grandiose. It is for this reason that our perestroyka is called revolutionary.

Paradoxical as it may seem, although difficulties have multiplied, I feel more confident we've chosen the right political course towards perestroyka and renovation of our society. How can I explain this? Probably now we know better what we want and how to reach it, and this gives us greater confidence.

In the party Central Committee we'll discuss the document for the coming 19th conference. I can tell you that it will give second wind to our plans and our work to implement the concept of perestroyka.

I might appear over-confident if I say only what I've said. Making decisions at this turning-point in the development of our society is a responsible thing, before our people above all. We're not guaranteed against mistakes, but we'd like them to be few, at least no big mistakes, because political mistakes are the worst. We'd like to fend them off. We are therefore making all our main decisions of principle with the active participation of all society and its intellectual forces, within the framework of the democratic process. This is the best way of avoiding political mistakes. This is why we are developing the processes of democratization and glasnost so persistently. We won't backtrack. It is perhaps in this area that perestroyka has made the greatest strides.

I've approached the second part of your question. Indeed, earlier, too, our society and party understood the need of reforms and renovation. Attempts to implement such reforms were made on a very large scale, including by, as you said, Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev and the leadership he headed. I think that in the times of L.I. Brezhnev the leadership under him also conceived and launched big plans. But they were not brought to fruition, mostly because they were not based on the decisive force—drawing people into the modernization and restructuring of society. We've learned a lesson from our history and this is why we are developing democratization with so much persistence.

The now popular expression "more democracy—more socialism" is more than a slogan, a pretty combination of words. It is a thoughtful guideline: Through developing the democratic process; through involving people in economic, political, social, and cultural reforms, to reveal the potential of socialism and all that is contained in this system.

Now that we have behind us 3 years and the experience of perestroyka, of our work at the new stage, we can say with confidence that perestroyka has become a cause of the entire people, a national cause.

Many generations, my generation for sure, may not have witnessed, may not remember such activity and interest in the affairs of society as we're observing. People are eagerly discussing the activities of party, state, and economic bodies, and all developments. Tremendous interest is being shown in everything taking place in our country. This is evidence of stagnation and apathy being overcome. Our life is tempestuous. It's no easy job to steer the ship in this turbulent sea. But we have the compass and the crew, and our ship is strong enough.

Jim Hogland: I'd like to ask you a number of more specific questions on perestroyka. You said that the present time is stormy and that there exist more difficulties than earlier in certain fields. I think a reform of prices is, in part, called upon to become an extremely important component of perestoyka. The system of subsidies operating in your country is part of the old social contract between the people and the government. Which means that every Soviet citizen receives a 3 ruble subsidy for every kilogram of meat and a 30 kopeck subsidy for every liter of milk which he buys. Do you believe that this system, so costly for the nation, needs to be changed? If you do believe so, how urgent is this task and how will it be accomplished?

Gorbachev: We're examining this problem and not only in the government quarters but in society. Those who stay in Moscow may confirm that our press is already carrying out a discussion of these issues. The discussion involves ordinary citizens, industrial workers, collective farmers, intellectuals, veterans, and experts. The problem concerns the whole of society.

Prices and price formation play rather an important role, to put it more precisely, in the package of measures constituting a radical economic reform. When I speak of prices, I mean wholesale, purchase, and retail prices. We want a new 5-year-plan to be based on these new prices.

How should we approach them in essence? The standpoint on this score has already taken shape in both government and scientific quarters. We've already preliminarily set it forth to the people. While reforming the prices and changing price formation we, above all, see to it that no decline will take place in real living standards.

You may ask what is the aim of all this. The aim is to make the prices correspond to real economic processes and reflect real expenses and work input. This will make it possible to cleanse the entire financial system and on this basis to more successfully develop economic accountability, to use in all work establishments the material incentives moving the economy in the right direction, toward greater scientific and technological progress and higher labor productivity, to search for ways of better meeting society's needs for means of production, commodities, and high-quality services.

Today we're very carefully thinking over the ways of compensating for the losses that might be caused by the introduction of new prices, specifically retail prices. When we're ready for this and when the measures are well-thought-out and weighed comprehensively, we'll submit them for nationwide discussion. We've promised this to the people and we'll act in this way. We'll do nothing without the people's consent.

Hogland: We just saw that a reform of prices gave birth to civil unrest and serious problems in neighboring socialist Poland. Do you suppose that you'll be able to avoid similar stormy events?

Gorbachev: The situation is different here. Our situation is characterized by the fact that the major mass of prices is under strict state control.

Therefore, it is very important to find the facet enabling us to combine the release of the economic mechanisms needed with the preservation of the necessary centralized control. I do not think this issue can be solved at one go. The shaping of a new price mechanism will be a process that will pass within the framework of economic reform.

We are being prodded from the inside and from the outside towards steps which would be tantamount to a leap. But we will act in a considered and prudent way, and will continuously seek counsel from the people via the democratic mechanism.

Anyway, I believe that after this answer THE WASHINGTON POST will stop advising us to take reckless steps to accelerate perestroyka.

Meg Greenfield: Mr Gorbachev, I would like to ask you a question concerning perestroyka in another sphere. You wrote about perestroyka in international relations, and particularly in relations between socialist countries.

You very vividly wrote that every country must exercise an absolute right to choose its own road of development: capitalism, socialism, or some other variant of the road. I would like to ask, to what degree and how could it be applied to the East European socialist countries? For instance, there are elements in society in Poland that call for a pluralistic system in which the Communist Party perhaps would not play the leading role. To what degree is that acceptable? To what degree is that endurable to you?

Gorbachev: I think you should better ask the Polish leadership about that. That would also correspond to the point of departure of your question. But still, I can say a few words.

We recognize each people's right, wherever in the world it lives, to social choice and to the choice of the way to improve its society. I think the Polish people can better see now what should be done for Poland to gain strength and consolidate so that its development would bear fruit for the people.

Whatever we do in our country is our affair. Perestroyka was brought about by our conditions. We need it. We will continue widening and deepening it. But we do not impose our methods for developing and improving society on anybody. That is everyone's own affair. I think the Poles will also see what they should do for Poland's development. I am sure that the bulk of people, the overwhelming majority of Polish society are for the road they chose after the war.

Greenfield: I would like in this connection to refer to one of your Belgrade statements. You said there that there are no circumstances under which interference by force into another country's affairs could occur, and under which such interference could be admissible. Does this mean that, as we see it in the West, a situation similar to that, say, in 1956 in Hungary or in 1968 in Czechoslovakia, that a similar situation would not occur again, and is such an interpretation correct?

Gorbachev: Yes, I did speak on that subject in Yugoslavia. I can only reiterate what I said then, and generally speaking, there is nothing I could add to that. I would only note the following, perhaps: Interference from any side is impermissible. When you speak about interference, I can see what you mean. But recalling those situations, I also have in mind something else, and here it is: Before what you said occurred, there was interference of a different kind.

Look how much time has passed since the war but the parliaments and bodies analogical to them in some Western capitals adopt resolutions which can be regarded only as interference in the home affairs of other countries.

The world has dramatically changed in the postwar decades, and today even the smallest people would not tolerate interference and commands from anybody. Our relations with the socialist countries are equal relations of independent states, relations of cooperation and mutual assistance. We share many things, including resources, and depend on one another in the sense that our cooperation allows and allowed in the past to build up the economy of each country and to carry out major social changes.

I believe such cooperation is a good basis, and it will play a positive role also at the new stage when deep changes in the socialist countries are under way.

Richard Smith: I would like to know your personal reaction to some specific proposals which are advanced on the threshold of the party conference. Specifically, do you support the proposal to limit the term of office for party leaders and, if you do, does it concern the post of general secretary?

Gorbachev: You will receive answers to these questions in coming days. For the time being, I would answer in one word—yes.

Smith: Still we hope that you will say more....

Gorbachev: I would anticipate what you will read in...what day is it now? Is it the 18th of May? In 5 or 6 days. THE WASHINGTON POST always wants to know more and earlier than others. (animation)

Someone corrects: "This is NEWSWEEK". (laughter)

Gorbachev: It's all the same. It is your empire. (laughter)

Greenfield: There is competition inside our empire, too. (animation)

Graham: Mr. Gorbachev, from the moment of our arrival here we see immense interest in the forthcoming party conference. Could you tell us in general outline what do you expect from this exceptionally important event?

Gorbachev: My expectations coincide with the expectations of society as a whole. We want to sum up the results of 3 years and to analyze already the perestroyka history. We want to make a critical analysis of this entire period and to draw lessons from it. Perhaps, some corrections will be needed. But the central question is: How to move the perestroyka forward, how to make it irreversible? That is why the questions of deepening economic reform and democratizing the party and society will be the principal ones. You will soon learn all the rest.

Richard Smith asked whether the publication of the well-known articles in newspapers SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and PRAVDA does not reflect serious differences in the Soviet leadership.

Gorbachev: I get the impression that the theme of serious differences among the Soviet leadership about perestroyka and assessment of the past is prompted by the West, not by Soviet editors. I don't know the motives of those who regularly tout this theme, which is constantly discussed in foreign radio programs in Russian and other languages. It may be a desire to understand what's going on in this country, or it may be a desire to make capital of the discussions being conducted here, sow suspicion, and provoke a real split in our leadership.

The present leadership, both in the Politburo and in the government, was mainly formed after April 1985, when we had already launched the policy of perestroyka. All

the members of our leadership are deeply committed to the cause of perestroyka and actively participate in formulating its policy and carrying it out.

Let's think it over together and the situation may become clearer to you. When people take on a task as ambitious as this and when they have to formulate not only strategy but also the tactics for attaining the goals they have set, can they do so without active debate or dialogue within the leadership and in society as a whole? This is what is happening now. The whole country has become one big debating club. And it is only natural that there is lively debate among the leadership about ways of handling the problems arising from perestroyka.

Only Jesus Christ knew all the answers to all questions and could feed 20,000 Jews with five loaves of bread. We do not possess such miraculous power and have no ready-made answers to all problems at hand. We are looking for such answers with the whole society. And this inevitably leads to discussions and heated debate. This is natural. The trouble is that for many years there was no such debate in society, in the party, in the Central Committee, in the government, or in the Politburo. And that caused many losses, mistakes, and omissions. It is a very big mistake to picture our current discussions as differences in the leadership. They are the normal democratic process. It is another thing that some people may want differences, divisions, and even battles within the Soviet leadership. But this has nothing to do with understanding the real situation within our leadership.

Smith: The thing is that we get the impression that many of your enthusiastic followers, people who support perestroyka, are concerned about a possible political division. There was a letter in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, whose author worried that "the Central Committee will hold a plenum and topple Gorbachev" (it's a quote). And he suggested holding a referendum on your leadership and your policy, in which everyone would participate. My question is this: Have you heard about that letter and what do you think about the idea of holding a referendum?

Gorbachev: That's not the only letter I've heard about. (laughter) I consider the appearance of such things to be a positive development. It means that society does care about who is in the country's leadership. It means that people are taking a great interest in what is happening. I think the fact you have mentioned is an interesting symbol, which also demonstrates the progress perestroyka is making. It shows that people have become involved in the political process and are eager to participate in it and express their opinions, their views. This is wonderful. It may be the main thing that came with perestroyka, because in the economy and in the social sphere we still have a lot of work to do. There are improvements there too, but we need time to change things in such a radical way that all society would feel the change. As regards the fears you have mentioned, nothing is happening in the party or in society to justify them. I don't mean myself. I am talking about the problem in general. And one has to know our political process to realize that if the general secretary did not have the support of his closest associates and the people he is working with, nothing would have changed here since April. Everything that has happened in our society, our party, and the Central Committee happened with the participation of the present leadership.

There is one more thing I want to say. Perestroyka is now bringing to the surface interesting new people in all spheres—in the political process, in the economy, and in culture. The development and deepening of democracy will, I believe, bring onto the political scene more and more interesting new people with fresh ideas. The aim of perestroyka is to create mechanisms that would regulate society and facilitate its self-adjustment within the framework of the democratic process. That will help involve the people and, of course, their best, intellectual forces, able and talented people at all levels and in all echelons, in managing the affairs of society and the state.

Our society will never again be what it was. It is changing. There are mechanisms working for this change. A great deal is to be done, but the train has already started off and is gathering speed.

Robert Kaiser: For me, a person who has lived in Moscow, the most dramatic changes are precisely the changes in the press and on television. Everything has become so interesting. Many political prisoners have been released, and many former refuseniks have been allowed to leave the USSR. On May 7 you stated that the goal is to create a socialist, law-based state. And you said in your very interesting written answers to our questions, freedom of speech is absolutely necessary. At the same time we see that some Soviet citizens find themselves in trouble because they, as it seems to us, simply want to exercise this right, to exercise the freedom of speech. I mean Airikyan in Armenia and Grigoryants in Moscow. Why does that happen? Is it because some officials have not yet mastered the new thinking or because, in your view, what these citizens do goes beyond freedom of speech?

Gorbachev: An interesting question. I will answer it in brief. The most substantial thing that perestroyka has shown is that our people, striving for renewal of society, for changes, have said in no uncertain terms: only within the framework of socialism and on the basis of its values.

Even such measures in the economy as the development of cooperatives, economic accountability, lease contract, and individual labor activity were and are discussed very seriously and scrupulously in our society from the following standpoint: Is it not a deviation from socialism? Does not it undermine the socialist principles? Today, nine-tenths of our country's population was born and grew up in the socialist period. And the present leadership is unable to do anything except develop socialism, which has opened a great road to us in all spheres of life.

We know socialism and its achievements, and we know its problems. And we will act within the framework of our socialist choice. That is why when they try to force other values on us, specifically in the sphere of ideology, it brings a critical reaction from the people. But it is also a democratic process. This is democracy.

Our people know that Grigoryants' "organization" is linked with the West organizationally and financially, that Western correspondents are his constant visitors and guests. That is why our people regard him as something alien, parasitizing on the democratic processes and on perestroyka. Alas, that happens sometimes. It also happens in nature: All kinds of parasites attach themselves to a living organism and try to damage it.

Our society is strong enough to cope with this, too. Once I said that the whole society will be resmelted in the perestroyka furnace. This will make it stronger and will open up even more its democratic, humane potential in the interests of man. Our people reject the proposals that we seek prospects elsewhere, for instance, the proposals that we eliminate socialist ownership, etc. This will not be accepted, this is an illusion, and you should be aware of this.

In conclusion I would like to express my satisfaction with our meeting and the hope, a slight hope (animation) that THE WASHINGTON POST and NEWSWEEK will cover the processes in the Soviet Union on a basis of an objective analysis and a serious and responsible approach. We are not asking for praise. We invite you to try and comprehend the truths born of perestroyka. Authoritative publications should do everything professionally.

Graham: If you will allow, we'd like to ask another very important question. A few words, please, about the summit, its content and atmosphere. You said in your written answers that you would welcome another meeting with President Reagan if you could sign an agreement to cut strategic offensive arms by half. Can we take it for granted that the understanding on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive arms is vital and close enough to completion enough to be signed with the ABM and SLCM talks still under way, that is, without waiting until the work on space and SLCM issues is finished?

Gorbachev: We are confirmed and principled advocates of resolute cuts in nuclear arsenals, and so we are for the signing of the treaty on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive weapons. As we see it, we have traveled a long way together in search of solutions. But what's the point in signing understandings on strategic offensive arms cuts in one sphere, if there is an arms race in space or at sea? I think you'll agree it's nonsense.

So our persistence isn't a whim, or a tactical move, or a subterfuge on the part of the Soviet side. It's a responsible, well thought-out attitude. It meets to the interests of the Soviet and American nations, and the whole world. If we were to replace one kind of arms race with another, what is more, in space, things would become really dramatic. We'd have undermined emergent confidence, and depreciated the experience stored up the Geneva talks. What we have here is a new kind and a new sphere of the arms race. We'd need new criteria to come close to understandings and arrive at agreements. And that would take us decades.

As I see it, those who encourage an arms race in space are committing a crime against their own and other nations. That has to be said with full clarity and responsibility. Such an approach and such thinking lead to destabilization, to unpredictability in questions of security. The advocates of that approach deserve to be condemned, deserve to be pilloried.

To leave sea-launched cruise missiles without limitations and beyond control would be another diversionary maneuver, another channel of the arms race.

So we tie all those issues together. I think it's a valid approach. The main thing is that we see ways to solve all those interrelated issues and arrive at a treaty on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive weapons. Then, we can proceed further.

Graham: I asked because, to my mind, both sides have made enough headway toward an accord. Now, take the SDI and ABM issue. As we see it, the Washington declaration brings us close enough to the main question: What will happen when the period of non-withdrawal from the ABM Treaty is over? Do you think the joint Washington statement offers a solution even now?

Gorbachev: I think what the statement says on understanding the ABM Treaty the way it was adopted in 1972 and the way both sides understood it before 1983 gives a basis for progress toward an agreement on 50-percent strategic offensive weapon cuts. But only that way.

I still have to answer another part of your question. We will work together with any U.S. Administration in that crucial field of Soviet-American relations. We shall seek ways to make new nuclear arms cuts in the framework fo the Geneva process. We'll be glad if it happens during Mr Reagan's presidency. If it happens under a new president, we aren't going to mark time either. We shall work on. It's all up to the U.S. side.

I'm going to talk to the President about cooperation in Mars expeditions.

Mikhail Gorbachev invites everybody to look at the pictures of the launch. He continues:

This is a mock-up of our Energya rocket. Last year it placed a 100-ton load in orbit. With some improvements, the rocket will be capable of carrying 200 tons.

Here's the picture of its start. I received it from Baykonur, which I visited last year. I will suggest to the President cooperation in organizing a joint flight to the Mars. The results expected to be produced by the SDI and ABM programs can be successfully achieved through peaceful projects for the development of space. For instance, the implementation of the project on a flight to Halley's Comet provided us with dozens of new materials and numerous scientific results in such areas as electronics, mathematics, and so on.

This is an area for work and cooperation worthy of the American and Soviet people. I will suggest to the President...

Hogland: As you probably know, we have published an article by Academician Sagdeyev on this issue.

Gorbachev: How interesting! Is it about Halley's Comet?

Hogland: About a joint flight to Mars. It is suggested that an automatic station be sent. As we see it, the flight could be feasible.

Gorbachev: That would be a tremendous breakthrough in science, technology, and engineering. In the meantime, you can see what we have been doing.... I am very glad to have met with you.

Graham and the others thank Gorbachev for the conversation and the interview.

Further Reportage on Upcoming Moscow Summit

Dates Announced

LD2105204888 Moscow TASS in English 2042 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 22 TASS—It has been announced here today that in keeping with the agreement reached President of the United States of America Ronald W. Reagan will be on an official visit in the USSR from May 29 to June 2, 1988 at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

More on Reagan Interview

PM2005192588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 May 88 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "United States: President R. Reagan's Interview"]

[Text] Washington, 20 May—President R. Reagan has granted an interview to a number of correspondents from Western countries, who asked him to describe how Washington sees the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow.

The head of the administration was asked this question: Would it be realistic to expect an agreement to be reached between the USSR and the United States on the reduction of strategic arms during the present U.S. Administration's remaining term in office? Answering this question, Reagan declared that work on drawing up the agreement is in full swing, but it is a far more complex matter to reach such a treaty than to draw up the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, which was signed during the previous, Washington summit meeting. We will continue this work at the upcoming meeting if the drafting of the agreement on strategic arms reduction has not been completed before it begins. I think, however, the President said, that it will be possible to reach such an agreement during the present administration's remaining term in office.

At the same time, the head of the White House once again spoke in defense of the "Star Wars" program which is being implemented by the Pentagon and which stands in the way of reaching agreement on the package of accords on strategic offensive arms and ABM defense. He said: "If we had such weapons, defensive weapons, I would not be against our eliminating offensive missiles." However, the President went on to admit, the question naturally arises: Why then is this system needed, if the missiles have been eliminated? Nevertheless, the President did not give a convincing answer to this question.

Reagan declared that, on the whole, he evaluates optimistically the prospects for arms control. "I think it has to be admitted," the President emphasized, "that victory in a nuclear war is impossible and that such a war must not be unleashed. If you get involved in such a conflict, how can you declare the winner if his country is poisoned by radiation and the people have nowhere to live? And just this will happen if we start to use the weapons which we have today. I believe that it is precisely this realization that has enabled us to achieve a certain success with reducing nuclear weapons."

Glazunov Comments

LD2105132688 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 21 May 88

[Viktor Glazunov commentary]

[Text] Preparations for the Soviet-American summit meeting that begins in Moscow on 29th May are about to be concluded. What do we expect from the summit? Viktor Glazunov elaborates:

It so happened that on the eve of another Soviet-American summit meeting, most people asked the following question: Will the treaty on eliminating two classes of nuclear missiles be ratified before it? The ratification got delayed because of procrastinations at the U.S. Senate. I won't dwell on the role played in this connection by the struggle between the Democratic and Repbulican parties in the framework of the presidential election campaign. I only want to call attention to a statement made by Senator Richard Lugar. He said that

Senate approval of the treaty in the next few days would be equally important, both in the context of relations with the USSR and in terms of trust in the United States, felt by the NATO allies.

Now there is talk that the treaty will be ratified in the middle of next week. Let us hope that these forecasts will materialize. This would be a good sign on the eve of the Moscow summit. The meeting promises to be an important one, even though the signing of another disarmament treaty on 50-percent cuts in strategic weapons will not take place in its course, as (?it was) planned. However, the two sides intend to do much during the summit in terms of drafting the new treaty. (?So) the Moscow summit will serve as a milestone on the path toward this goal. There are also prospects for making headway in other directions of disarmament. Besides, the example of political settlement in Afghanistan raised hopes that a realistic approach to solving regional problems is possible. As for bilateral ties, reassuring factors are in evidence in this area too. All signs are that the Moscow summit is to be a major event on the international scene.

But analyzing the propsects for the summit and for the overall development of Soviet-American relations, we unfortunately have to (?report) the fact that tributes will be long paid yet to mutal mistrust. President Reagan also touched upon that problem of mistrust in his answers to Western newsmen on his coming Moscow visit. In this connection we may well wonder if plans to deploy weapons in space help break down that mistrust. President Reagan has again been promoting (?a) program of space weapons. Or can more trust follow from stepped-up supplies of American weapons to the Afghan opposition intending to continue bloodshed, now that the peace accord in Afghanistan has come into force?

We are raising the issue of demilitarizing the rivaly between nations. We'd like to end viewing all global events in the light of Soviet-American rivalry. (?With their) potential of (?mutual) destruction the Soviet Union and the United States are just bound to be partners in seeking ways to provide [words indistinct] difficult steps in that direction have been taken. The Moscow summit is to give a new impetus to accelerated progress in that direction.

Shultz Comments Cited

LD2105144688 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Washington May 21 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz said yesterday that he expected there to be at the upcoming summit meeting in Moscow "a very businesslike exploration and discussion of all four elements of the agenda that we have in place with the Soviets, namely human rights, bilateral relations, regional tension points, and the various aspects of the arms control." "Quite possibly we will have a little headway on each one", he noted in a Worldnet Television press conference for West European and Canadian newsmen.

According to George Shultz: "We will discuss various aspects of our bilateral relations. We will discuss arms control, not only strategic arms and defense in space, but no doubt, chemical weapons, confidence-building measures, conventional arms concerns."

At the stated time the U.S. secretary of state pointed out that agreements on a 50-per cent reduction of the strategic arsenals of both countries would not be signed at the Moscow meeting. "It's very clear now that we will not be able to reach final agreement on the strategic arms cuts that we have been working on in time for the summit," Shultz said. Yet, as he put it, "there has been an immense amount of progress" made at these talks in recent years. The U.S. secretary of state also voiced hope that the U.S. Senate would endorse the ratification of the INF Treaty before the start of President Reagan's official visit to the Soviet Union".

More on Shultz Assessment

LD2205205888 Moscow TASS in English 2040 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] Washington May 22 TASS—Today the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz expressed the hope that the Senate will approve the Soviet-American treaty to liquidate intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, by the time of the start of the summit meeting in Moscow between the U.S. President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary of the CPSU CC Mikhail Gorbachev.

In an interview with the ABC television company George Shultz said that approval of the treaty would quite definitely help the meeting. He said that from 1972 the United States did not ratify treaties with the Soviet Union and there were several such treaties on the table. He said it would be good to register the fact that now the U.S. could do it. Shultz pointed out that the ratification process was a very painstaking one, involving the holding of about seventy hearings with over 1,300 questions asked and answered.

Questioned about the possibility of the USSR and the USA concluding an agreement to reduce strategic offensive arms before the end of the tenure of the present administration, George Shultz said that, in his opinion, this was possible. He said he felt confident that at the Moscow summit meeting the participants would express the desire to continue to work hard on this. But whether this would come about or not, Shultz said he did not know, for the problems, in his view, were very difficult.

At the same time, questioned as to whether the USA would come up with any new proposal in respect of the SDI at the Moscow meeting, Shultz said that the President's position on this question remained unchanged.

At the negotiating table, the secretary of state went on to say, there are many problems we are wrestling with. He said that the participants of the Washington summit also attempted to agree on formulations....The difficulty was, however, that the sides, according to Shultz, were not in agreement regarding their meaning. He said there was still much work to be done.

Senate Debate on INF Treaty Continues

Amendment Rejected

LD2005223488 Moscow TASS in English 2214 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Washington May 21 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko reports:

By the overwhelming majority of votes, the Senate of the U.S. Congress rejected the amendment aimed at complicating the process of discussing the Soviet-American INF Treaty. The author of the amendment, conservatively-minded Republican Senator Steven Symms of Idaho proposed that the coming of the treaty into effect be linked with the "assurances" by the administration that the USSR observes the previous arrangements in the area of arms control. The meaning of this move by the adversaries of the treaty becomes clear if one recalls that the Reagan Administration has earlier been trying more than once to accuse the Soviet Union of "violations" of the arrangements. Trying to collect the maximum number of votes, the adversaries of the treaty ensured that the voting in the Senate was held on each of the five clauses of the amendment. Senator Richard Lugar (Republican, Indiana) described this procedure of discussing the amendment as a tactic of procrastinations. Senator David Durenberger (Republic, Minnesota) said that he is against the amendment since it is aimed at torpedoing the INF treaty. The results of the voting on the five clauses of the amendment showed that this opinion is held by the majority of senators. Senator Ted Stevens (Republica, Alaska) who was on the group of observers from the U.S. senate that followed the course of the talks in Geneva said he can assure the Senate that he is confident about the treaty and that no changes whatsoever should be made in the treaty.

The Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole made a call to his collagues not to drag out the discussion of the treaty. He emphasized the need to press for real progress in discussing the treaty and urged the legislators to endorse the treaty before the Soviet-American summit in Moscow.

Reagan Urges Ratification

LD2105213388 Moscow TASS in English 2050 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Washington May 21 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan today called on the Senate to approve the Soviet-U.S. Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty so that the ratification documents could be signed during his forthcoming visit to Moscow.

"This treaty has had a thorough and useful examination in committee," he said in his weekly radio address.

"Now the Senate can join with me and show both our allies and adversaries that it too wants to help build a brighter peace and better world."

Reagan expressed the hope that "the Senate will provide its consent to ratification of the INF Treaty in time to bring it into force during my meetings with the general secretary in Moscow".

Senate 'Dragging Its Feet'

LD2205210088 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1358 GMT 22 May 88

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] [Bovin] The whole of the past week has been occupied with preparations for the meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan. In truth we live in a world of paradoxes. In the United States the current President is called Roosevelt in reverse. It was with the real Roosevelt that we won the war, and now it is with the Roosevelt in reverse that it seems that we are beginning to win peace. Reagan frequently expresses the notion that he has made the United States stronger and the Russians, the Soviets, respect strength, and that is why Moscow has moved to improve Soviet-U.S. relations. Well, perhaps this inference comforts the President himself in some way and helps him explain himself to people who are more Reaganite than Reagan himself.

I permit myself to draw up a different hypothesis. The point is not that the United States has become stronger. The point is that we have grown wiser and in the past 3 years Soviet foreign policy has, by comparison with what went before, become much more realistic and flexible, directed at compromises and achieving mutual accords.

And Reagan himself—contrary to many forecasts, my own included—has changed noticeably, very noticeably. True, he has not burned all that he once held sacred, but he has paid reverence to a great deal that he once deemed fit only for burning. And this is the result: The capital of the Evil Empire awaits Reagan.

In connection with the President's visit I receive quite a number of letters asking certain questions. Let me cite two of these questions. Comrades say this sort of thing: To judge from all accounts, no documents of a strategic nature will be signed in Moscow so why then is the meeting taking place, what is the point of this meeting? I think that all of us must somehow take a wider view of events like this and meetings of this type, because it is important to exchange signatures, but it is no less important to exchange opinions. We ourselves as well as the Americans have a global spectrum of interests, and these interests exist. There are problems where our interests clash and collide and so points of tension may arise

leading to complications in our relations. It is very important to hold meetings periodically in order to compare notes, give precise definitions of our positions, and to seek ways toward mutual understanding. This next summit, which will be the fourth between our leaders, will be the natural continuation of the smoothing out, as it were, of Soviet-U.S. relations by a step along this road and that, regardless of any signatures, is very important and necessary. All the more so because documents will be signed.

The second question which people ask also goes something like this: Reagan is leaving the White House. He is already on the way out. What is the point of meeting him again? Perhaps it would be better to wait for the next President. Well, on this score I think that the whole point is that we are dealing not only with Reagan, as such. We are dealing with the person and the country which he represents, all the more so since this visit, exchanging visits, was envisaged back in Geneva. Like solid political partners we observe what we have agreed on.

But the Americans themselves are far from looking so solid. Indeed it is they who are guided by the prevailing situation and subordinate their policy to election considerations. Let us take the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic weapons. Of course the objective difficulties which those involved in the Geneva talks are encountering are very great. There are great difficulties. However, I am convinced that the United States quite consciously put the brakes on to ensure that this great prize should not go to Reagan but to the next President. And I even believe that these election considerations have had their role to play in the fact that the Senate has been dragging its feet with regard to ratifying the treaty on eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Many senators evidently do not wish to let Reagan have this tasty goodie and are dragging their feet on ratification, although after the last meeting between Shevardnadze and Shultz all the questions that were worrying the senators were solved.

Nonetheless, things are going very slowly. Being specific, let's say they met on Tuesday and began their discussions in the Senate. (Clerk) got up on to the rostrum and began reading the text of the treaty when they suddenly thought—are we quorate? So the reading was interrupted and they held a roll call. There was not a quorum so the meeting broke up and they all went away. That's how they work, with all the speed of a snail, wrote THE WASHINGTON POST the day before yesterday. But nonetheless let us hope that the senators will eventually place the national interests of the United States higher than these short term considerations.

If Reagan does not gain the agreement of the Senate before he leaves for Moscow that will of course be a great blot to Reagan's personal prestige and naturally to the prestige of the United States.

China

NPC Vice Chairman Meets Soviet Delegation

OW2205150188 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 17 May 88

[Text] On Monday in Beijing, Peng Chong, vice chairman of the National People's Congress [NPC] Standing Committee of the PRC, met with a delegation from the Journalists Union of the Soviet Union, headed by Afanasyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Journalists Union, and chief editor of PRAVDA. Peng Chong said that there is traditional friendship between China and the Soviet Union. He called for expanding the ties between Chinese and Soviet journalists. The vice chairman also pointed out the obstacles in relations between China and the Soviet Union.

Friendship Delegation Arrives in Beijing

OW2205112688 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] A delegation of the Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Association headed by Tikhvinskiy, chairman of the Central Council of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Association, arrived in Beijing on 19 May for a good-will visit. During its stay in China, it will sign a 1988-89 cooperation plan with the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries and the China-USSR Friendship Association. The delegation will also visit Wuhan, Shanghai, and Xian.

Hydrology Protocol Signed in Beijing

OW2305070888 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] According to a XINHUA News Agency report, on 18 May the Soviet Union and China signed a protocol in Beijing on the third meeting regarding hydrological information exchange and hydrological forecasts for the Heilongjiang area.

CPC's Tian Jiyun Interviewed on Economic Reform

PM2005120588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 May 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview in Beijing with Tian Jiyun, chairman of the Sino-Soviet Commission for Economic, Trade, and Scientific and Technical Cooperation, by special correspondents A. Druzenko, N. Yefimov, L. Kapelyushnyy, and Yu. Savenkov: "Tian Jiyun: Features of the Economic Reform in China"; date of interview not given—first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction and final two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA note]

[Text] IZVESTIYA special correspondents A. Druzenko, N. Yefimov, L. Kapelyushnyy, and Yu. Savenkov, who were in Beijing at the invitation of the newspaper

JINGJI RIBAO, asked Tian Jiyun, chairman of the Sino-Soviet Commission for Economic, Trade, and Scientific and Technical Cooperation to answer a number of questions of interest to our readers.

[IZVESTIYA] The 13th CPC Congress adopted a decision on the need to build socialism with specific Chinese features. What are its main characteristics? What, in your opinion, is the main problem at the present stage of building socialism in China?

[Tian Jiyun] Before answering this question I should like to convey through IZVESTIYA friendly greetings to the Soviet people.

Back at the 12th CPC Congress Deng Xiaoping put forward a proposal for "building socialism with specific Chinese features." The 13th CPC Congress, on the basis of a generalization of practical experience since the Third Plenum of the CPC Central Committee of the 11th Convocation, defined the main line for implementing this historic task. The thrust of this main line is, by making economic building the focus of attention, to persistently defend four main principles: following the path of socialism, the democratic dictatorship of the people, the leading role of the CPC, Marxism-Leninism and the ideas of Mao Zedong, and also to firmly adhere to the policy of pursuing reform and expanding ties with the outside world and to struggle for our country's transformation, in the course of this building, into a rich, powerful, democratic, and civilized modern socialist state.

The main problem for China, which is at the initial stage of building socialism, is the inadequate development of socialist production forces. With a view to their fuller and speediest development, our state must accelerate the implementation of reform in order to lend it an all-embracing nature and must persistently develop the socialist planned commodity economy.

[IZVESTIYA] The 13th CPC Congress noted that in the past 9 years profound changes have taken place in China's appearance. What specific achievements, in your view, are the most important? What have you failed to achieve? What difficulties exist on the path of making headway?

[Tian Jiyun] In the past 9 years the PRC's GNP, state financial revenue, and the average incomes of the urban and rural population have as a whole doubled, which has made it possible to embark on the solution of or to determine ways of resolving some serious socioeconomic problems which had been creating specific difficulties for a long time. For instance:

1. In 1987 the PRC's GNP reached 11,092 billion yuan, and its average annual growth rates were 11.1 percent; in industry the volume of gross output reached 1,378 billion yuan; in rural areas the volume of nonagricultural output for the first time exceeded the volume of gross agricultural output.

2. The overwhelming majority of the country's population of 1 billion is clothed and fed and some regions are embarking on the path of moderate prosperity.

3. In the cities broad opportunities have opened up for finding work and the number of those who have found work there has reached 70 million while 80 million peasants have moved fully or in part to the sphere of nonagricultural production.

4. The opportunities provided by the market have as a whole changed the previous situation whereby an acute shortage of consumer goods was felt for a long time.

5. A marked improvement has been achieved in rectifying the serious disproportions which existed in the national economy. The national economy has gradually moved to a footing of mainly harmonious development.

But we realize that we still have a great many problems and difficulties. Right now the most acute problem of economic and public life is the rapid growth of prices—last year alone the retail price index in the country increased 7.3 percent; at the same time questions like the money issue, the increased volumes of capital construction, and the rapid growth rate of the consumption fund remained unresolved. We will continue to intensify and accelerate the reform and on the basis of increasing the economy's efficiency we will seek to ensure the national economy's rapid and stable development.

[IZVESTIYA] As far as we know the aim of the reform in China is to create a socialist planned commodity economy system. The state determines market activity and the market regulates the operation of enterprises. What are these three main links? What is their effectiveness? Commodity-money relations are now entering all spheres of the life of society; how is the process of society's adaptation to this proceeding?

[Tian Jiyun] We believe that, in developing a socialist planned commodity economy, it is necessary to consciously adhere to and use the law of value. Capitalism uses a form of market regulation in developing its commodity economy, but it can also be used in the socialist commodity economy.

The socialist planned commodity economy must be a system uniting the plan and the market into a single whole. Several basic elements must be explained here. First, the socialist commodity economy differs qualitatively from the capitalist forms of ownership. Second, it is essential to put commodity exchange and the law of value at the basis of planning. Third, the sphere of operation of the plan and the market encompasses all society.

Proceeding from this premise we believe that the mechanism for the operation of the new economy should be based on the principle of "the state regulation of the

market and the enterprises' market orientation." Relations between these three links look like this: The state, using economic, legal, and the necessary administrative methods, regulates market demand and supply, creates the relevant economic and social conditions, and thus prompts enterprises to take the correct economic decisions.

The overwhelming majority of our country's citizens welcome this new system, because they have been truly convinced that the economy has been really developed and that thanks to this they are already obtaining a tangible benefit. Of course, there are still people who to this day cannot fully adapt to the new system and that is not surprising, but I want to believe that as the new economic system acquires vital force, these people will be able to adapt under the new conditions.

[IZVESTIYA] In China numerous resolutions have been published on the management of the enterprises' activity. How are enterprises' rights implemented? How do you assess legislative activity at the present stage of political, economic, and social reform?

[Tian Jiyun] The session of the National People's Congress of the Seventh Convocation passed the Law on Enterprises Owned by All the People. The results of restructuring at enterprises were thus enshrined and generalized in legal form and the rights and duties of the enterprise owned by all the people were clearly defined. That is an important result of our reform.

Legislative work in China has been considerably accelerated in the course of the reforms. Right now the legislative organs at various levels have already elaborated and promulgated 1,700 various laws, decrees and rules and from these the central organs have prepared 600 legal enactments and provincial and city organs 1,100 enactments. Of course, in quantitative terms the laws which we have elaborated are a long way from satisfying the requirements of political and economic development and some of them will be further improved and revised in the course of practice.

[IZVESTIYA] The family contract in the countryside was once called the "first breakthrough" accomplished by the Chinese economic reform and it provided an answer to the question of how to mobilize the activeness of the many millions of peasants. Has it fulfilled its function? What are the further prospects for the development of agriculture in China?

[Tian Jiyun] Right now the family production contract based on public ownership of the land is acquiring the form of a "two-level system of economic management" combining the household contract and a unified services sphere. This system has created opportunities for a breakthrough in the reform of China's rural economy. Its thrust is concluded in the transformation of the overcentralized structure of production into a structure uniting centralization and decentralization. Everything which can be done by one family and by one household independently, let them do—that is the decentralized management of the economy; but whatever requires pooled efforts, for instance the construction of irrigation installations, the destruction of insect pests over vast areas of land, the purchase of large agricultural equipment, the creation of large processing enterprises—all this is done by common efforts, and that is the centralized management of the economy.

At present contracting production units based on the household differ from the small one-man farm which existed previously in the form of a single family and single household. Modern contracting farms are gradually moving to specialization, to a higher level of social division of labor. The government must help the peasants to implement the restructuring of the production structure promptly, with a consideration for local features.

The existence in the Chinese countryside of different forms of economic management—the decentralized and simple, the centralized and complex—thus promotes the development of production forces. These forms of economic management have met with the approval of the broad peasant masses and they will be practiced for a long time and be improved as the reform is implemented.

Of course, the level of economic development in China is different in different parts of the country and the forms of economic management therefore cannot be identical; we must proceed from reality and act in accordance with local conditions. In a number of economically developed regions such as some maritime zones, the suburbs of big and medium cities, large industrial and mining regions, substantial plant growing facilities have already emerged. Obviously, following the development of industry in rural areas and the movement of the workforce to the sphere of nonagricultural production, the trend toward the further development of quite large plant growing facilities should appear.

[IZVESTIYA] Both the USSR and the PRC are now actively seeking new forms of management. To all appearances the similarity of the questions which the two countries are resolving has opened up broad prospects for the mutually advantageous exchange of experience. What is attracting China's attention in the process of the renewal of life under way in the USSR?

[Tian Jiyun] Many socialist states are now strenuously seeking optimum paths for combining the fundamental principles of Marxism with the practice of their country. The socialist countries can exchange the experience they have accumulated and borrow everything of value, but this loaning cannot be mechanical, inasmuch as specific circumstances in these countries differ. The PRC people are attentively following the progress of restructuring in the USSR and wish you success in it.

From IZVESTIYA'S Files [subhead]

Tian Jiyun was born in 1929. The XINHUA information report on the results of the recent first session of the National People's Congress of the Seventh Convocation noted: "Tian Jiyun, a specialist in financial and economic affairs, continues to hold the post of vice premier in the new PRC Government. Tian Jiyun first became vice premier in June 1983. Before that he worked for a long time in the local people's governments of Southwest China. Tian Jiyun played an important part in the replacement of deductions from profit with taxes, for which Zhao Ziyang had fought. This measure, as practice has proven, had a positive effect on the management of enterprises and on the state's financial revenue. Tian Jiyun also took part in the leadership of the prices and wages reform which has been initiated.

"From 1953 through the early sixties he worked in the Guizhou Province Finance Department. Then he was deputy chief and chief of Sichuan Province Finance Department. When Zhao Ziyang, then first secretary of the Sichuan Province CPC Committee, began a reform of the economic system as an experiment, Tian Jiyun gave his vigorous support to his work. In 1981 Tian Jiyun was moved to the post of deputy secretary general of the State Council. At the 12th party congress in 1982 he was elected a member of the Central Committee and in 1985 he joined the staff of the Politburo and Secretariat of the CPC Central Committee. In 1987 at the 13th party congress he was elected a member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo."

Northeast Asia

Trawler Reportedly Runs Aground North of Japan

LD2005114988 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Tokyo May 20 TASS—The Soviet fishing trawler "Snarskiy" ran aground off the island of Rebun-Jima near the northern tip of Japan's second biggest island of Hokkaido, last night. A TASS correspondent has been told at the USSR Consultate-General in Sapporo that none of the crew members were injured. The cause of the incident is unknown. But the KYODO News Agency reports that the incident took place in poor weather conditions.

According to a representative of the Japan sea safety agency, a Japanese rescue ship approached the place of the incident approximately in three hours' time, but the Soviet trawler captain refused from assistance. [sentence as received] Specialists of the agency believe that for the fishing trawler there is now no danger of sinking. The trawler with a water displacement of 163 tons, which is still stranded, has possibly been holed. But the sea in the area of the Rebun-Jima island is becoming rougher. A Japanese representative said that a cable about the accident was sent to the Sakhalin shipping line administration in Kholmsk.

Passengers of Burned Ship Leave Japan

LD2305075588 Moscow TASS in English 1342 GMT 23 Mar 88

[Text] Tokyo May 22 TASS—About 400 passengers and the crew of the motor ship Priamurye steamed from port Osaka to Nakhodka aboard the motor ship Konstantin Chernenko today. A heavy fire that broke out in the ship when it was moored at Osaka port killed 11 Soviet tourists, members of the international youth friendship cruise of Japan.

At a press conference in Tokyo Keizo Obuchi, general secretary of Japan's Cabinet of Ministers, expressed on behalf of the Japanese Government condolences over the loss of human life as a result of the fire in the Soviet motor ship.

Members of the special commission set up to look into the circumstances of the tragedy arrived in Japan from the USSR Saturday. Several crew members of the Priamurye remain together with them in Osaka for investigation and servicing of the burnt motor ship docked at Osaka port. The Japanese investigating authorities failed to find any material evidence to point up the cause of the fire, KYODO reports.

"It is hard to come to one's senses after this tragedy and the death of friends. But Soviet people working here and support from the homeland encouraged us at this painful moment," Muscovite Darya Strennikova, a participant in the cruise, told TASS. "We would like to express most profound gratitude to the Japanese public, the local organisations of friendship with the USSR and ordinary citizens of Osaka for the warm care of us which they showed".

Japan Fishery Negotiations in Moscow Close

OW2205131888 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Soviet-Japanese negotiations on Japanese fishermen's catch quota for sea tangle and sea urchin in Soviet waters around Kaigara Island [words indistinct] held at the Ministry of the Fish Industry in Moscow were terminated on 21 May. The negotiations were conducted pursuant to an agreement relating to sea tangle collection concluded in 1981. At the end of the negotiations, the two sides agreed that the collection of sea tangle will be conducted by 375 three-man crew fishing boats in the waters of the designated area between June and September. In compensation for the sea tangle catch, the Japanese side will pay 115 million yen, an increase of 5 million yen over last year.

The meeting also agreed on a catch quota for sea urchin. Japanese fishermen began catching sea urchin in the designated area for the first time last year. The catch quota is 260 tons—at the same level as that for last year, and the compensation for it was set at 62 million yen.

The participants in the negotiations also exchanged views on ways of strengthening mutual cooperation within the framework of this agreement. The protocol of the agreement and the papers accessory to it were signed by (Igor Smerinikov), representative of the Soviet Ministry of the Fish Industry who led the Soviet delegation, and Eishiro Shoji, vice chairman-director of Hokkaido Fisheries Association who headed the Japanese party.

Biryukova Leaves DPRK for Home 21 May

LD2105125388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1030 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] A CPSU Central Committee delegation, headed by Comrade Biryukova, left Pyongyang for home today. The delegation visited the DPRK within the program of developing ties between the CPSU Central Committee and the Workers' Party of Korea.

Met by Lukyanov

LD2105221788 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 21 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A CPSU delegation led by Comrade Biryukova returned to Moscow from Pyongyang today. The delegation was in the DPRK in line with planned contacts between the CPSU and the Korean Workers' Party. At the airport in Moscow, the delegation was met by Comrade Lukyanov and other senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee.

DPRK Denies Contacts With South Korea

LD2005160788 Moscow TASS in English 1212 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Pyongyang May 20 TASS—A spokesman for the Committee for the Peaceful Reunification of the Fatherland has refuted recent reports from Seoul about alleged current contacts between the north and south of Korea.

He was quoted by the KOREAN CENTRAL NEWS AGENCY (KCNA) today as dismissing the reports on such contacts and also Japanese press reports on a visit by a highly-placed official from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to Seoul as "an invention pure and simple."

"There are no contacts, let alone reciprocal trips, between north and south at present," the spokesman said.

He pointed in this connection to the fact that Seoul has for about four months now failed to respond to Pyongyang's proposal for a joint conference of the north and south of Korea.

Seoul has also refused, according to the spokesman, to pass on letters from the students and rector of Pyongyang's Kim Il-song University to the student body and rector of Seoul University proposing a meeting between students from north and south.

The South Korean side's reports on purported dialogue between north and south through various channels, the spokesman said, are prompted by a desire to achieve unseemly political ends.

The South Korean authorities, he stressed, should bear all responsibility for the consequences of their attempts to "hoodwink the people and public opinion."

South Koreans Oppose U.S. Military Presence

LD2105130788 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS—TASS political news analyst Mikhail Yakovlev writes:

According to reports of foreign news agencies, mass student anti-government actions are continuing in big cities of South Korea. They are being held in time for the eighth anniversary of the brutal repression perpetrated by the South Korean military against civilians of Kwangju and other parts of the country, who demanded that the state of emergency be lifted and police repressions be ended.

The current anti-government demonstrations are vividly of an anti-American character. Their participants demand immediate withdrawal of the U.S. 40,000-strong occupation corps from the south of the Korean peninsula. Speakers at numerous meetings say that over 40 odd years the United States has been backing repressive dictatorial regimes in Seoul, changing each other [as received], interfering in South Korea's internal affairs. The United States bears direct responsibility for the division of Korea.

The unwarranted over 40-year long occupation of South Korea by American troops, the fact that the south of the peninsula has been turned into a major military base, into a U.S. nuclear bridgehead account for the persisting tension in South Korea and the whole of the Korea peninsula and the outstanding Korean issue, i.e. unification of the South and the North of the country. Moreover, the United States continues building up the military effort in South Korea, just as in the whole of the Asia-Pacific region, intensifying militarisation of the South Korean regime. This is shown, isn't it, by the practice of U.S. holding of large-scale American-South Korean joint exercises involving big military formations of South Korea, like "Team Spirit," which are fraught with serious complications of the over-all situation in the Korean peninsula and in Asia.

Frequently one hears from Washington assurances of the readiness to settle crisis regional situations on the basis of the principles of the new political thinking. But the paradox is that such a readiness is displayed only when things do not concern the United States directly, and in Washington they stubbornly go away from solution of the regional problems for which the United States itself bears directly the responsibility, as in the case of South Korea. The American Administration has been refusing for over ten years now to comply with the U.N. General Assembly's resolution, which calls for withdrawal from South Korea of all foreign troops staying there under the U.N. flag and for durable peace to come in place of outdated armistice, so as to enable the Korean people to resolve their problems themselves.

There is no doubt that the military-political confrontation in the Korean peninsula should be done away with. And it is therefore necessary to put an end to the American military presence in South Korea, that is to withdraw from the Korean territory the American troops with all the armaments, including nuclear weapons, the deployment of which in the south of the Korean paninsula is ungrounded. Many politicians and statesmen in the world are confident that this would open the way to a constructive inter-Korean dialogue, as it is proposed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The aim of such a dialogue is known to be Korea's unity on a peaceful democratic basis without any interference from outside.

The struggle of the South Korean population for freedom and independence, the DPRK's calls for national reconciliation are bound in the final account to bring about peaceful reunification of the motherland—the cherished aspiration of the Korean people.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Further Reportage on Thai Prime Minister's Visit

Prem Speaks on ASEAN

BK2005100188 Bangkok Voice of Free Asia in Thai 1030 GMT 18 May 88

[Report on Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon's 17 May speech at the Institute of International Relations in Moscow on the topic of peace and security in Southeast Asia]

[Text] Prime Minister General Prem Tinsulanon wants the Soviet Union to play a constructive role in achieving a settlement of the Cambodian problem, which has destabilized the Southeast Asian region over the past 9 years. Addressing the Institute of International Relations in Moscow on 17 May, Gen Prem Tinsulanon said that the Soviet Union may give special attention to the Pacific Basin, which is believed to be growing into a center of prosperity. Nonetheless, as he comes from Southeast Asia, which is part of the Pacific Basin, Gen Prem said he therefore would like to talk about peace and security in the region—for this would contribute to a better understanding of Southeast Asia as a region—and of regional as well as global peace and security.

The prime minister said that Southeast Asia is an integral part of Asia and the Pacific. It has been known as an area of contention by the great powers, involving the powers' interests. It is a region of strategic importance with a sealane linking the Pacific and Indian Oceans. The region is rich in natural resources, with the majority of its population having a high level of education. It enjoys a satisfactorily high economic growth rate.

It was only a few decades ago that the countries in Southeast Asia began to play a significant role in international politics as, with the sole exception of Thailand, they were under colonial rule by Western powers for a long time. This had prevented them from having direct relations despite the fact that they are close neighbors. They have been living as strangers. After regaining their independence, those countries which have had different experiences and backgrounds in terms of administrative, economic, and social situations have been busy with their immediate task of national reconstruction. This has prevented them from reaching out to each other to foster mutual understanding and achieve regional unity. Anyway, they realized that living in isolation would expose them to the risk of dangers and deprive them of bargaining power, thus making it impossible for them to achieve self-determination in regional matters.

In 1961, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philiipines, which realized the need for and interests from multilateral cooperation, agreed to found the Association of Southeast Asia, or ASA. Nonetheless, this association was short-lived because of the lack of unity and the fact that it had only a few of the countries in the region as members. Anyway, the effort set an example for a collective endeavor for mutual cooperation to ward off confrontation within the region. Finally in 1967, five countries in the region—Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand—successfully established a mechanism for regional cooperation, known now under the name of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, or ASEAN.

The prime minister continued that the three major objectives of ASEAN when it was first established were:

1. To promote regional economic, social, and cultural developments on the basis of the various projects of cooperation;

2. To uphold political and economic stability of the region by reducing the great powers' rivalry in the region; and

3. To serve as a forum to settle regional problems.

In 1971, realizing that the contention of external powers' had caused tension in the region, ASEAN made public its long-term plan to establish a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality in Southeast Asia. In 1976, ASEAN members adopted a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation of Southeast Asia with a broad base allowing other countries in the region to join as members. Major objectives of the treaty are to have nations agree upon a peaceful settlement of disputes, accept procedures stipulated in the treaty on this matter, and uphold the guidelines laid down for interstate relations on the basis of regional unity, useful cooperation, and nonaggression among member countries.

The prime minister said that, 20 years after its establishment, ASEAN has become the most successful regional grouping of developing countries despite differences and problems existing among member nations. The organization has received broad-based recognition. A close cooperation, a sense of common interests, and mutual dependability among member nations has given the association a new dimension; that is, a political strength. ASEAN covers a vast area. It has gained an additional member, Brunei. ASEAN has a population of over 280 million; it has bountiful natural resources, a high growth rate, and close political, economic, and cultural cooperation. ASEAN, therefore, is playing an important role as an economic and political force in Asia and the Pacific, a region now with a bright economic future.

The Thai prime minister said that ASEAN, in addition to being a mechanism for regional economic and social cooperation, has achieved the bargaining power in the international arena needed by member nations for self-determination in regional matters. Thanks to the existence of ASEAN, this region has achieved relative regional security at present. That means ASEAN has contributed to peace and security in this region. Concerning political cooperation, ASEAN's long-term objective is still to transform Southeast Asia into a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality in order to create a favorable climate for regional countries to fully exploit their respective resources in economic and social developments without having to worry about dangers from aggression, whether within the region or by great powers. ASEAN's objective is thus close to that of the Soviet Union under the leadership of General Secretary Gorbachev, an attempt to create a peaceful international climate conducive for the Soviet policy of openness and reforms.

Alas, it is regrettable that a major obstacle still exists, blocking the effort to build a peaceful international climate. The Cambodian problem has been prolonged for more than 9 years now and constitutes a serious threat to regional security. So long as the problem is not solved, peace can never be achieved in the region.

The prime minister said that, in order to achieve a genuine peace for Southeast Asia, ASEAN has been trying to find a political settlement to the Cambodian problem. ASEAN believes that a durable peace can be achieved only when Cambodia has regained its independence, is neutral, nonaligned, and does not pose a security threat to its neighbors. ASEAN believes that the Cambodian conflict is threatening the security of all countries involved and is obstructing their development.

General Secretary Gorbachev once stated at an international conference on a nuclear-free world and the survival of mankind in Moscow in February 1987 that it is not acceptable for a country to think only of preserving its security at the expenses of others. What the general secretary stated is very true and is acceptable to everyone. If we take this truth into account and accept that there is a need for a peaceful international climate, if we have political purpose, it is never impossible for us to achieve a genuine peace in this region, which would also contribute to global peace.

Gen Prem believes that Southeast Asian countries would be thankful and ASEAN would adopt a positive attitude toward the Soviet Union if the Soviet Union could play a constructive role in convincing others to solve the Cambodian problem based on the above-mentioned line in the way it has played a leading role in the settlement of the conflict in Afghanistan. This positive attitude would serve as a strong foundation for future development of cooperation in economic and other fields between the Soviet Union and ASEAN countries, both in the bilateral framework and in the context of the Pacific Basin.

The prime minister said in the end that, speaking in his capacity as leader of the Thai Government, he would like to confirm that we do not want to block the great powers' from playing a role in Southeast Asia. What we would like to see is a constructive role played by the great powers. He believes that if the Soviet Union could help solve the Cambodian problem and achieve genuine peace for the region, all countries in this region would welcome it as a great power with a constructive role and would develop cooperation and strengthen relations with it.

Sitthi Holds Bangkok Briefing

BK2205135688 Bangkok Voice of Free Asia in Thai 1030 GMT 20 May 88

["Special report"]

[Text] Foreign Minister Air Chief Marshal Sitthi Sawetsila returned from the Soviet Union on 19 May. He told a news conference upon his arrival that Prime Minister General Prem Tinsulanon's visit to the Soviet Union was successful beyond expectations.

He reported that the meeting between the Thai and Soviet prime ministers was cordial. The two reported to each other on the economic situation in their respective countries. The Soviet prime minister talked about the new Soviet policies of glasnost and perestroyka, which

are aimed at bringing progress to the Soviet Union. He said that successful implementation of the new Soviet policies depends on global peace. The foreign minister said that Gen Prem Tinsulanon hailed the agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on the elimination of intermediate nuclear missiles, and hoped that the coming U.S.-Soviet summit in Moscow next month will be successful and result in agreements on several issues. Gen Prem Tinsulanon also regarded the Soviet policy expounded in Vladivostok as pertaining to a new feature considered by ASEAN countries as being more constructive. He hailed the Soviet decision on troop withdrawal from Afghanistan.

The two leaders discussed the Cambodian conflict in detail. They agreed that the solution to the Cambodian problem must be achieved by political means. Vietnamese troops must be withdrawn from Cambodia and a national reconciliation government be established. There might be differences in approaches to solve the Cambodian conflict, but the Soviet Union promised to help arrange for negotiations to achieve peace in the region. The Soviet Union said it will raise the issue with Vietnam.

Air Chief Marshal Sitthi Sawetsila said that he also discussed the Cambodian conflict with Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, whom he met for about an hour and a half. The two discussed Soviet policies in general, Soviet-U.S. relations, Sino-Soviet relations, as well as Soviet policies towards India, Japan, Australia, and Southeast Asia. On the Cambodian conflict, the Soviet Union agreed with Thailand that it is too long to wait for Vietnam to withdraw its troops from Cambodia in 1990, and that there could be no genuine peace by that time. For them, peace should be secured first through negotiations between the Cambodian factions with Vietnam's participation. Air Chief Marshal Sitthi Sawetsila said that he proposed holding a conference in Jakarta attended by the four Khmer factions, Vietnam, and concerned countries. The conference would try to find out, first, the format and policy of the national reconciliation government, and, second, the timetable of Vietnamese troop withdrawal from Cambodia and the deadline of the pullout. He said that the agreement on Cambodia would use the agreement on Afghanistan as an example. The Soviet Union agreed to his proposal.

Air Chief Marshal Sitthi Sawetsila said that the Soviet Union thinks that not only Indonesia but also Thailand should play a vital role in settling the Cambodian conflict. The Soviet Union wanted him to have another meeting with Vietnamese Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach. Air Chief Marshal Sitthi agreed to the Soviet request, saying he would be able to meet the latter after the general elections in Thailand.

The Thai foreign minister reported that economic matters were discussed during the meeting between the Thai and Soviet prime ministers. They noted that bilateral trade is still too little, amounting to only about $100 million annually. They, therefore, wish to see an expansion of trade between Thailand and the Soviet Union in the future. Meanwhile, talks between the Thai private sector and the Soviet Union have achieved great success, and several agreements have been reached pointing to an improvement in bilateral trade and investment in the future. Two agreements have been signed;namely, the agreement on bilateral consultations between the Thai and Soviet Foreign Ministries, and the agreement on scientific and technological cooperation.

Thai Prime Minister Gen Prem Tinsulanon also held a meeting with CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. The Soviet leader expressed a wish to see collaboration and cooperation among all countries in the world so that peace on earth can be established. They also discussed the Cambodian issue. Air Chief Marshal Sitthi summed up saying that the meeting between Prime Minister Gen Prem Tinsulanon and General Secretary Gorbachev was carried out in a friendly and cordial atmosphere. The Soviet Union has gained a better understanding of Thailand. It has given Thailand an especially warm welcome.

Prem Holds News Conference

BK2305092788 Moscow in Thai to Thailand 1100 GMT 19 May 88

[News conference by Thai Prime Minister General Prem Tinsulanon with unidentified correspondents on 18 May at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Press Center—recorded]

[Text] [Prem] I am visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet prime minister who kindly invited us to visit his beautiful and great country. We are proud to have been invited, and it is a great honor to make this current visit to the Soviet Union. We have been accorded a very warm welcome. The Soviet Government and prime minister were kind enough to give us a warm reception. On behalf of the Thai Government and people, we thank the Soviet Government and people for their hospitality.

During the 2 days in Moscow, we held official consultations with the Soviet prime minister and General Secretary Gorbachev. I will sum up the consultations as follows:

First, we dicussed economic relations, starting with briefings about the two countries' economic problems and progress. We agreed that our economic relations—trade volume—have been too limited; we will try to increase the trade volume and value. That was the economic issue. On investment, we discussed ways to increase investment between our two countries. We feel that there are good prospects for increased investment.

On the exchange of political views, the Soviet side—the Soviet prime minister and other senior Soviet officials—explained what you correspondents call the glasnost and perestroyka policies and their implementation. He [the

Soviet prime minister] said that the Soviet Government is determined to effectively implement the policies in order to create world peace. We both discussed issues. In short, we agreed that world peace can be realized only if everyone is committed to peace and is politically constructive. We also referred to General Secretary Gorbachev's statement which said: Security cannot be realized if the security of one country negatively affects the security of another country. We agreed with him on this statement. We also discussed this matter.

A topic we specifically discussed was how to achieve peace in various regions of the world. I appealed for peace in my region—the same way peace is being brought to Afghanistan. We discussed solutions to the Cambodian problem in the interest of peace in that region. The Cambodian problem has dragged on for 9 years; we tried to seek ways to bring peace to that region in the same way the United States and the Soviet Union jointly brought peace to Afghanistan.

Those were the major points of our consultations. On the last topic of our consultations, we invited him [the Soviet prime minister] to visit our country. I would like to reiterate here that, on behalf of the Thai Government and people, I feel it is a great honor for me to visit the Soviet Union and to have a chance to meet General Secretary Gorbachev and Prime Minister Ryzhkov. Both of them are highly respectable persons. They have given us full cooperation and a very warm reception. I would like to thank them here again.

[Correspondent] As we have noted, there have been consultations during your current visit here about the constant development of Soviet-Thai relations. What are the reasons, and is there any chance for further improvement of relations and bilateral cooperation?

[Prem] In fact, relations between our two countries date back more than a century. I think there will always be improvement since our two countries are determined to improve our relations. Because that is our common desire, there should be no problem for our relations. General Secretary Gorbachev himself stated that we must collaborate and cooperate with each other in order to establish peace. We are very happy to hear that. We ourselves are trying to be constructive on that matter. Our mutual efforts to expand political, economic, commercial, and cultural ties will contribute to the strengthening of our relations.

[Correspondent] I would like to have your opinion about the coming U.S.-Soviet summit in Moscow.

[Prem] I fully welcome another U.S.-Soviet summit late this month. It will be another important milestone in the effort to build world peace. In fact, the previous summits have been successful. The Afghanistan issue is another good example of the great powers' efforts to bring peace to the world. I have mentioned this to General Secretary Gorbachev and also wished him success in the coming summit as this will contribute to durable peace in the world.

[Correspondent] The signing of a peace accord for the political settlement on the Afghanistan problem is considered a success at a certain level. What is your opinion about the effect the agreement on Afghanistan could have on the Cambodian problem?

[Prem] I think that the settlement of the problem in Afghanistan is a good example for peace settlement in other regions. Yesterday, we also talked about this issue. We believe that there should also be a settlement for Cambodia if settlement can be achieved for Afghanistan.

[Correspondent] Mr Prime Minister, I would like to ask you about your general impressions concerning your current visit and meetings with the Soviet leaders.

[Prem] I am deeply impressed. We have been given a very good reception and full cooperation in consultations. I think all those will help strengthen our mutual relations in the interests of our two nations, both politically and economically.

Joint Communique Signed

PM2305102188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 88 Second Edition p 6

["Joint Communique on Official Visit to USSR by Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon paid an official visit to the Soviet Union on 16-22 May at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The Thai Government head laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The important visitor and his retinue traveled to Kiev and Leningrad, where they were warmly received.

CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev had a meeting with Thai Prime Minister P. Tinsulanon.

Talks took place between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Thai Prime Minister P. Tinsulanon.

Taking part in the talks on the Soviet side were: E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; B.L. Tolstykh, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.I. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign economic relations; I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister; and A.I. Valkov, USSR ambassador to Thailand. Taking part on the Thai side were: Chief Air Marshal Sitthi Sawetsila, minister of foreign affairs;

Prachuap Suntharangkun, minister of the interior; Michai Ruchuphan, minister of the Prime Minister's Office; Arun Phanuphong, minister of the Prime Minister's Office; Prasong Sunsiri, prime minister's general secretary; Kasemsamoson Kasemsi, permanent deputy minister of foreign affairs; and Prachit Rotchanaphruk, Thai ambassador to the USSR.

The Thai Government head was told about the restructuring taking place in the Soviet Union, which is geared to solving the country's paramount socioeconomic development problems.

In turn, P. Tinsulanon gave information on achievements in implementing the program for the national economic and social development of Thailand.

The USSR Council of Ministers chairman and the Thai prime minister exchanged in a frank and friendly atmosphere opinions on a wide range of questions of bilateral relations and on regional and other problems of mutual interest relating to the international situation.

The participants in the talks expressed satisfaction with the state of relations between the two countries and confirmed the intention to continue promoting their development in line with the joint Soviet-Thai communique of 28 March 1979 on the basis of equality, mutual respect, noninterference in internal affairs, and mutual advantage. It was noted that the visit to Thailand by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, in March 1987 and the return visit to the Soviet Union in May that year by Foreign Minister Sitthi Sawetsila aided the improvement of mutual understanding between the two countries and thereby contributed to the widening of bilateral relations.

The government heads expressed a willingness to actively contribute to widening bilateral trade and economic relations on a mutually advantageous basis, utilizing the existing potential. In this connection, they noted that the first session of the Soviet-Thai trade commission, which takes place in Moscow in the second half of this year, will be an important step forward in developing trade between the two countries. There was discussion of the possibility of promoting the transfer of technology and of the expansion of economic cooperation between the two countries.

The mutual desire was expressed to develop exchanges in the spheres of culture, science, sport, and tourism in order to strengthen mutual understanding and friendship between the two countries' peoples.

The sides acknowledged as useful the periodic consultations between the two countries' foreign ministers and signed an agreement between the Soviet and Thai Governments on bilateral consultations.

An intergovernment agreement on scientific-technical cooperation was also signed during the visit.

Mention was made of the great importance of contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Thai National Assembly in terms of strengthening mutual understanding between the two countries.

During the discussion of the contemporary international situation, N.I. Ryzhkov told the Thai prime minister about the Soviet Union's efforts to halt the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, to prevent it from being transferred to space, and to ban nuclear tests and eliminate chemical weapons.

The government heads noted with satisfaction a number of positive changes in the international situation and stressed the need for all states to increase their efforts to promote this process. In this connection, P. Tinsulanon welcomed the signing between the USSR and the United States of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, which is an important milestone in the two countries' efforts to cut their nuclear arsenals. He also welcomed the efforts to reach Soviet-American accords on reducing strategic armaments. The Thai side expressed the hope that the upcoming Moscow summit will serve the cause of peace and stability and the achievement of further progress in efforts on disarmament and arms control.

The sides stressed the significance of the upcoming third special session of the UN General Assembly, which is intended to ensure creation of favorable conditions for advancing the cause of disarmament and making UN activity in that sphere more effective.

The participants in the talks discussed the regional conflicts that exist in various parts of the world and agreed that it is necessary to achieve a peaceful political settlement of them. In this context, they welcomed the signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, which could be a positive precedent for solving other regional problems.

The USSR Council of Ministers chairman and Thai prime minister noted a coincidence of views that the Cambodian problem must be solved by political means. The sides conducted a detailed exchange of opinions on the principles on which such a political settlement could be achieved and agreed that the discussion must be continued.

The Soviet side explained the nature of the USSR's new approach to the Asian-Pacific region set out by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, in his speech in Vladivostok and in his replies to questions put by the newspaper MERDEKA.

The Thai prime minister told the Soviet side about various aspects of ASEAN activity, including decisions of the third ASEAN summit, which pave the way for

expanding the ASEAN market and creating better opportunities for the ASEAN states to develop relations with countries of the Asian-Pacific and other regions in the areas of trade and business and investment activity.

The Soviet Government head noted that the Soviet Union pays tribute to the progress made by ASEAN in the 2 decades of its existence and confirmed the USSR's readiness to establish dialogue with the regional organization.

The participants in the talks exchanged opinions on the contemporary economic situation in the world. They stressed, in particular, the need for the earliest, just solution of the problems of low prices for raw material commodities, which is considerably inhibiting trade and the prospects of economic growth for many states in various parts of the world, primarily the developing countries. Both sides acknowledged the pressing need to eliminate the restrictive policy and measures which are considerably hindering access to markets. They also noted that the developing countries' economic viability is essential to the growth of world trade and international economic development. Emphasis was also placed on the need to take coordinated steps in the international plane to ease the burden of their growing debts and ensure resources for growth. In this context, satisfaction was expressed with the fact that cooperation between the two countries within the framework of international organizations and forums is contributing to maintaining efforts to improve the world economy.

Both sides expressed satisfaction with the results of the visit to the USSR by Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon, which has imparted new momentum to the further development of Thai-Soviet relations and has contributed to strengthening mutual understanding between the two countries' peoples.

The Thai prime minister expressed gratitude for the cordial reception accorded to him and his retinue by the Soviet Government and people during their stay in the USSR and invited USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov to pay an official visit to Thailand. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

Prem Departs 22 May

LD2205080888 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0758 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] Leningrad, 22 May (TASS)—Prem Tinsulanon, prime minister of the Kingdom of Thailand, left the USSR today. He was in the Soviet Union for an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

Volskiy Comments on Visit

OW2205214288 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 17 May 88

[Volskiy commentary]

[Text] Events of great significance that would never have happened before are taking place in Asia. The visit to the Soviet Union by Prem Tinsulanon, prime minister of Thailand, can be considered as one such event. Undoubtedly, the visit itself and the Thai prime minister's talks with the Soviet leadership have testified to the important changes in the Asian-Pacific region and in Asia as a whole.

As you know, the Soviet Union and Thailand are not only thousands of miles apart but also have basically different social and economic systems. Besides, there has been a long history, especially since World War II, of different and sometimes conflicting political views between the two countries on many important issues. These are known to all. Therefore, the Thai prime minister's visit to Moscow is of special significance, and it is of great importance in light of the current changes in Asia.

Here I am referring to economic changes characterized by rapid economic growth in a number of East Asian countries, including Thailand, and the aggravation of their problems with Western neocolonialists, first of all, the United States. I am also referring to the political changes in Asia as reflected in the aspirations of the Asian-Pacific countries to eliminate the military and nuclear threat clouding the region, and to strengthen peace and stability there. The famous Vladivostok proposal has given a strong impetus to these aspirations. The proposal, which was put forward about 2 years ago by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, outlines an extensive plan for strengthening security and developing cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region.

In a recent meeting at the Kremlin with Takako Doi, chairwoman of the Central Executive Committee of the Japan Socialist Party, Comrade Gorbachev said: We are realists, and we realize the vastness, complexity, and contradiction of that great part of the present-day world, which is to play an ever bigger role in the fate of human civilization. We now see a lot of problems there and many hotspots. We are not inclined to speed up events and do not expect quick results. But one should not be discouraged by this. It is essential to make the first steps. Moreover, we believe that if all countries of the Asian-Pacific region—particularly such states as China, the Soviet Union, India, the United States, Japan, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Australia—show wisdom worthy of their peoples, relationships in the region will be given a powerful impetus and a sound orientation. The principles on which the relationships between the Asian-Pacific countries can be built are universal, including the recognition of the right of everyone to a free choice, renunciation of interference and imposition of one's views, a balance of interests, and the awareness that the time has come when not a single people, even the smallest one, will put up with coercion [qiang zhi].

However, it is no secret that there are still people who are attempting to impose neocolonialist coercion on the Asia-Pacific countries and peoples. Especially in view of the economic growth achieved by a number of Asian

countries, Washington and Tokyo have begun to regard these countries as their rivals. Motivated by a growing desire to impose coercion, the United States and other industrialized capitalist countries have adopted protectionist trade measures such as artificially lowering the export prices of raw materials from the developing countries in Asia, and trying to raise the interest rate of their debts.

We should draw two conclusions from such practices by the neocolonialists: First, they affect not only small but also big countries in Asia. As far as this point is concerned, China is no exception. The U.S. obstruction against Chinese textile exports is only one of the proofs. Second, neocolonialism is more and more integrated with militarism in Asia and the Asian-Pacific region. Obviously, it is not accidental that the Pentagon has recently stepped up its militarist preparedness, including nuclear preparedness, in the Asian-Pacific region. A review of the map of U.S. military bases in the region and the navigation routes of the U.S. 7th Fleet will show that this preparedness is targeted not only against Washington's potential rivals but also against Asian countries that can be exploited by the neocolonialists. A case in point is the U.S. arms supply to Taiwan, which Washington regards as the bridgehead against the PRC.

Therefore, the reality and development of the situation in Asia have time and again proved that the struggle for peace should be inseparable from the struggle against the neocolonialists and for a new just economic order. The awareness of this is an important feature of the new political thinking which has continued to blaze its path in the Asian-Pacific region. The process of spreading the new political thinking is being expanded. The Thai prime minister's visit to Moscow is a manifestation of this process. In spite of differences between the two countries, the visit itself has clearly shown the common ground of the vital interests of the Asian-Pacific countries, their desire for mutually beneficial cooperation, and for political settlement of conflicts and disputes. This process, although it will advance gradually, has increasingly become the decisive factor in the Asian-Pacific region.

New Zealand Parliamentarians Begin USSR Visit

Greeted by Voss

PM2605102388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Visit"]

[Text] A delegation from the New Zealand Parliament headed by House of Representatives Speaker T.K. Burke has arrived in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The guests had a conversation with USSR Supreme Soviet deputies in the Kremlin on 19 May.

The delegation members were briefed on the progress of restructuring in our country's economic and social life and were told about the enhanced role and responsibility of soviets of people's deputies for the state of affairs on their territories.

Welcoming the guests, A.E. Voss, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, expressed confidence that the delegation's visit will be highly important not only for development of bilateral parliamentary ties but also for interstate relations.

Our visit, T.K. Burke noted, is the second in the history of contacts between the two countries' parliaments. This is why it is treated as highly important in the sphere of deepening mutual understanding and expanding various exchanges between the two supreme organs of state power.

The guest stressed that the delegation includes representatives of the ruling party and the opposition, expressing all political currents in parliament. All of them, he said, are interested in the changes taking place in Soviet society.

Taking part in the conversation were USSR Supreme Soviet Deputies A.S. Ivanov and A.S. Isayev; USSR Ambassador to New Zealand Yu.M. Sokolov; and New Zealand's ambassador to the USSR, J.G. McArthur.

A dinner in honor of the delegation was given on behalf of representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers on the same day.

The guests visited the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum.

The delegation stopped over in Tashkent en route to Moscow. A conversation took place in the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium about the program for accelerating the republic's socioeconomic development. The guests saw the sights in Tashkent and Samarkand.

Received by Gromyko

LD2005203888 Moscow TASS in English 1952 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 20 TASS—A parliamentary delegation of New Zealand is staying here. It is headed by Speaker of the House of Representatives Thomas Kerry Burke, and includes two representatives of the ruling Labour Party—Colin Trevor Mullard and Noel Scott, and two representatives from the opposition New Zealand National Party—George Frederich Gair and John Finley Luxton. The delegation is accompanied by Parliamentary Secretary Jenevieve Orr.

Andrey Gromyko received the delegation in the Kremlin today. [This and following additions and variations are noted in a similar report published by Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 21 May in its Second Edition on page 4. Here the PRAVDA report reads: "Andrey

Gromyko received the delegation in the Kremlin on 20 May."] The conversation passed in a friendly and sincere atmosphere [Here PRAVDA reads: "The conversation passed in a friendly and frank [otkrovennyy] atmosphere."]

After Andrey Gromyko had spoken in detail about how the restructuring of every area in the life of society proceeds in the Soviet Union, one of the guests, chairman of the Parliamentary Commission for Education and Science, Noel Scott, said that transformations in the areas of education and science were under way in New Zealand at present with taking into account the Soviet Union's experience.

Noel Scott: This is a scaled-down model of Soviet perestroyka.

Andrey Gromyko: Then there are two countries in the world now that are implementing perestroyka.

Alongside the scopeful restructuring in the USSR, problems of the development of bilateral relations and global problems were discussed during the conversation with the emphasis on the consolidation of security in the vast Asia-Pacific region.

Andrey Gromyko said that the Soviet Union had always been striving to maintain good friendly relations with New Zealand. In his opinion, there have never been obstacles to this. Though the two countries have different social systems, the common stand in favour of the consolidation of peace and prevention of war can serve as a basis for the widening of bilateral relations. In these matters the two countries have common views. This follows also from the pronouncements of the guests.

The sides exchanged views on the importance of the coming visit of the President of the United States to Moscow and were unanimous in the opinion that the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan should bring good results.

Discussing problems connected with the creation of a nuclear weapons-free zone in the South Pacific, Colin Trevor Mullard said that though New Zealand plays an insignificant role in the Treaty of Rarotonga, it upholds firmly and consistently its stand for peace, against nuclear tests. [Here the PRAVDA report reads: "Discussing problems connected with the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, Colin..."] The Soviet Union's decision on a moratorium on nuclear testing met with broad approval in New Zealand and the report that the USSR ended its moratorium was deplored. [Here PRAVDA reads: "...and the report that the USSR ended its moratorium was regretted."]

Andrey Gromyko set out in detail the Soviet Union's stand on this matter. "The USSR declares for a treaty on ending nuclear testing in which other nuclear powers would participate. When it stopped nuclear testing and staged no nuclear explosions over many months, we hoped that other nuclear powers, above all, the United States, will follow a good example. But the USA has not wanted to do so. Quite the contrary, it continued nuclear explosions, and in an even more intensive way. All this was damaging the Soviet Union's defence potential, and it was compelled to resume testing. The USSR and the USA now conduct talks on ending nuclear testing. Questions of appropriate verification are intensively discussed, and we hope that the talks will be concluded successfully."

George Frederick Gair said that if nuclear weapons are eliminated and conventional weapons remain, a war can break out without the use of nuclear weapons.

Andrey Gromyko said to this that the USSR is for the reduction of not only nuclear, but also conventional armaments. The USSR made this proposal at various forums more than once. Regrettably, a positive result in this direction has not yet been achieved. The public should speak out louder on the question of disarmament. But countries, New Zealand included, can and must also state their viewpoint in favour of disarmament. The voice of small countries, if they take a common stand, carries much weight in international politics.

The same applies to the problem of Asian-Pacific security, whose solution was suggested in the known Vladivostok initiative of the USSR. If such countries as New Zealand and Australia declared in support of the opening of negotiations on this major problem, their stand would contribute to the improvement of the situation in that vast region.

Possibilities for the development of bilateral relations were discussed on the initiative of New Zealand. Such aspects as agriculture, housing construction and geothermal power were emphasized.

At the conclusion of the conversation Noel Scott declared that it was a great honour to the whole of the delegation to place a wreath at the Unknown Soldier's Tomb near the Kremlin Wall. He was a school pupil when the war was raging in Europe, and he was overjoyed by the turning point in the operations on the Soviet-German front when the battle of Moscow was won.

"I have left part of my heart here", he said. "You won a great victory in that war. Since that time I always feel that I am part of my country and my people which is close to you in spirit. I am now proud to represent New Zealand which declares for a world without nuclear arms."

New Zealand parliamentarians also expressed the confidence that Soviet people will achieve success in perestroyka. Within the few days that the guests have been staying in the Soviet Union, they saw purposefulness and persistence. They regard these qualities as being common to Soviet people.

Andrey Gromyko conveyed the best wishes for the Parliament and people of New Zealand and on behalf of the Soviet Union expressed the wish to maintain friendly relations with New Zealand, to develop and enrich them. [Here PRAVDA reads: "...and on behalf of the Soviet Union expressed the wish to maintain only friendly relations with New Zealand, to develop and to enrich them."]

Taking part in the conversation from the Soviet side were Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Avgust Voss, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet writer Anatoliy Ivanov, chief of the Department of International Relations of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Eduard Kuzmin, USSR Ambassador to New Zealand Yuriy Sokolov. Taking part in the conversation from the New Zealand side were Assistant Editor of the journal THE LISTENER Helen Pask, New Zealand's Ambassador to the USSR John George McArthur, Second Secretary of the Embassy Cecil Hillier. [Here the PRAVDA report reads: "In the conversation were Yu.M. Sokolov, USSR ambassador to New Zealand; and John George McArthur, New Zealand ambassador to the USSR."]

SRV Foreign Minister Makes Moscow Stopover

LD2105124588 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1117 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 21 May (TASS)—Nguyen Co Thach, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers, and SRV foreign minister, arrived in Moscow today. He is on his way to a session of the Coordinating Bureau of the Nonaligned Movement in Havana and the 111th special session of the UN General Assembly in New York, at the head of a Vietnamese delegation.

Near East & South Asia

Last Troop Unit Leaves Nangarhar Province

LD2205161088 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] Kabul, 22 May (TASS)—The last column of Soviet troops in the province of Nangarhar arrived in Kabul today from Jalalabad. Now that this unit has been withdrawn, no Soviet troops are left in the province.

After a short rest, the unit will move toward the Afghan-Soviet border near the town of Termez. The withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops from Afghanistan is being carried out in keeping with the schedule worked out in Geneva.

Infantry Unit Returns

LD2105104688 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0958 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Termez (southern border of the USSR), 21 May (TASS)—Today, the people living in the Soviet town of Termez and the Afghan town of Khayraton [name as received] again witnessed an exciting event—the return to the motherland of a second group of internationalist servicemen. Another motorized infantry unit from the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan moved across the bridge of friendship linking the banks of the Amu-Darya, the river making the border. It is here, at the USSR's southern boundaries, that the Geneva agreements are coming into force.

This unit was one of the first to come to the aid of the Afghan people at the request of the country's legitimate government. Its officers and men escorted convoys carrying goods for the peaceful Afghan population 679 times.

A meeting was held in Termez in honor of the returning internationalist servicemen. It was attended by the relatives and loved ones of the officers and men, town leaders, and youth delegations that had arrived from Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and other Soviet republics. After a brief rest, the servicemen of the unit left for the place in which they are permanently stationed.

Moscow Endorses Afghan Charge Against Pakistan

PM2005155788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Report on USSR Foreign Ministry stance on alleged infringement of Geneva agreements by Pakistani side: "Around Afghanistan: Arms Deliveries Are Increasing"]

[Text] According to a report of the BAKHTAR news agency, the Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan has handed an official note to the group of UN observers in Kabul in connection with the Pakistani side's deviation from the provisions of the Geneva Agreements. This has manifested itself in the recent expansion of the scale of arms and ammunition deliveries to the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan from Pakistan. This is the second note transmitted by the Republic of Afghanistan to the group of UN observers on this issue.

IN THIS CONTEXT, OUR CORRESPONDENT WAS TOLD THE FOLLOWING AT THE USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY INFORMATION DEPARTMENT [capitalization as published]:

The deliveries of arms and ammunition to the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan from Pakistan are a blatant violation of the Geneva Agreements which came into force 15 May. These actions of the Pakistani side run counter the obligations which ensue from the bilateral agreement between Afghanistan and Pakistan on the

principles of mutual relations and, in particular, on noninterference and renunciation of intervention. The concrete meaning of these obligations as applied to Pakistan obliges it to discontinue the whole range of operations and actions relating to interference in Afghanistan's affairs, including, specifically, making its territory available for hostile actions against the other side, refraining from all forms of intervention and all acts of interference be it military, political, or economic, discontinuing assistance, encouragement, and support for all rebel or separatist activities and training, equipping, funding, and recruiting mercernaries on its territory. In accordance with the letter and spirit of this agreement Pakistan is not allowed to pass on any weapons or equipment of whatever origin to antigovernment groupings. The Soviet Union as a guarantor of the Afghan-Pakistani settlement proceeds from the fact that the obligations accepted by Pakistan under the aforementioned bilateral agreement, including the obligation not to hand over any arms or equipment to the opposition, must be strictly observed and implemented by Pakistan.

The Geneva agreements have only just come into force. The withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan has begun. The Soviet Union and Afghanistan are honestly implementing the obligations which they accepted under the Geneva agreements and they call on Pakistan to do likewise.

Egypt's 'Abd al-Majid Continues Visit

Meets Gorbachev

PM2305093388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 May 1988 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under the headline "Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and 'Ismat 'Abd Al-Majid"]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev met in the Kremlin 20 May with 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs of Egypt, who is staying in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

'Abd al-Majid conveyed to Mikhail Gorbachev a personal message from Egyptian President Husni Mubarak.

Gorbachev hailed the spirit and contents of this message. 'Abd al-Majid's visit is viewed in the Soviet Union as a good sign in Soviet-Egyptian relations, which are marked by dynamism and a greater degree of friendship and mutual understanding.

'Abd al-Majid said that the Egyptian leadership considered the foreign minister's visit to the USSR to be historic. The current meeting between Moscow and Cairo, the Soviet Union and Egypt will occupy a worthy place in relations between the two countries.

Gorbachev and 'Abd al-Majid held a substantive exchange of views on major world issues and ways of further developing Soviet-Egyptian relations, which was marked by a spirit of openness, mutual goodwill and respect.

Gorbachev stressed that "our approach to present-day international affairs is based on realities and takes account of the interests of all states. Within the framework of this approach, the Soviet leadership does everything to take international relations out of the state of confrontation, to reduce military confrontation, takes steps to cut down nuclear and conventional weapons, ban chemical weapons, to create a secure an, in the long term, non-nuclear world. The Soviet union consistently works toward settling regional conflicts through political means on the basis of balanced interests of all sides. There is an urgent need to solve the acute problems connected with overcoming economic backwardness, non-equivalent exchange and foreign indebtedness."

"The Soviet Union does not foist its approach on anyone and does not pretend to know the ultimate truth. We are for solving pressing problems through the efforts of all nations on the path of dialogue and extensive contacts.

"Building new international relations is a common concern for the world community. This is why the USSR welcomes any initiatives furthering the process of improvement in international relations and leading to broader cooperation and interaction among states."

'Abd al-Majid stressed that Egypt shares the philosophy and objectives of the Soviet Union's foreign policy. He remarked that their close or identical positions on the key problems of the times form a good basis for interaction between the two countries on the international scene.

Gorbachev and 'Abd al-Majid were unanimous that real prerequisite conditions are shaping for a comprehensive and just settlement in the Middle East.

Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet Union is acting vigorously for an early end to this most complicated and protracted regional conflict.

"It is essential to keep firmly in touch with realities. The key issue of a settlement is the Palestinian one. Without the PLO's involvement the process of a settlement will not go forward.

"But it is no less important to take account of the interests of also other sides, namely Syria, Jordan, and Israel. The present situation opens up opportunities to convene an international conference under the UN aegis. These opportunities should not be missed.

"As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is prepared to cooperate with all the participants in the peace process."

'Abd al-Majid expressed agreement with the Soviet approach to resolving the Middle East problem. He emphasized that the Soviet Union has a key, highly important role to play in a Middle East settlement. Egypt is prepared to continue exchanging opinions with the Soviet Union on every aspect of such a settlement.

'Abd al-Majid added that the Egyptian people will never forget the assistance given by the USSR to the economic development of their country and will remember that the Aswan High Dam was built with Soviet help. He declared that the President and Government of Egypt are interested in broader Egyptian-Soviet ties in the economy, trade, science, engineering and culture.

"The Egyptian Government is looking forward with optimism upon prospects for developing bilateral relations with the USSR."

Gorbachev described relations with Arab countries as an important aspect of the Soviet Union's policy. "Much significance is attached to them. We want to broaden and consolidate cooperation with all Arab countries."

"The Soviet Union is for developing relations with Egypt in every way as well. Essential support will be given on the Soviet side to efforts for developing cooperation with Egypt in various fields. Egypt will find the Soviet Union a good partner," Gorbachev continued.

He asked 'Abd al-Majid to convey greetings and the best of wishes to President Mubarak of Egypt.

Taking part in the meeting also were Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, and Salah al-Din Hasan Basyuni, Egyptian ambassador to the USSR.

Talks With Shevardnadze

PM2305103988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 May 1988 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the headline "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, had talks with 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and foreign minister of the Arab Republic of Egypt, in Moscow 20 May. 'Abd Al-Majid is staying in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

At the beginning of the talks, which proceeded in a businesslike and unconstrained atmosphere, 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid made a high assessment of his meeting and conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and stressed their importance as a major landmark in relations between the two countries.

The policy pursued by the Soviet leadership, he said, is characterized by a wise, serious and realistic approach toward resolving international and regional problems, and internal tasks as well.

The sides had a constructive exchange of views on specific issues of Soviet-Egyptian relations and prospects of their development.

Eduard Shevardnadze noted that after years of stagnation, Soviet-Egyptian bialteral relations had developed positively in recent years and that progress had been made in many areas. The Soviet Union intends to continue promoting these relations on a mutually beneficial, equal, and stable basis. This meets the interests of the people of the two countries and contributes to strengthening peace and international security.

Touching upon trade and economic cooperation, the ministers expressed satisfaction over a great deal of work done in this field and emphasized that this made it possible to feel optimistic about the future. At the same time, they pointed to the existing untapped potential for expanding bilateral relations. A Soviet-Egyptian intergovernmental agreement on economic, trade, scientific and technological cooperation is called upon to promote these ties.

Discussing a wide range of international issues, the sides noted the proximity and concurrence of stances. They said it was especially important that the international community moved steadily toward ensuring a nucear-free and nonviolent world, lowering the level of military, and above all nuclear, confrontation, and promoting trust and mutual understanding among nations.

Shevardnadze called 'Abd al-Majid's attention to the concept of creating a comprehensive system of peace and international security advanced by the 27th CPSU Congress, and discussed the Soviet Union's efforts to implement it at the current bilateral and multilateral disarmament talks. He also spoke about the preparation for the Soviet-American summit.

'Abd al-Majid said that the Soviet Union's dynamic and constructive line toward improving international climate and ridding mankind of the threat of a thermonuclear holocaust had enlisted the support and understanding of the Egyptian leadership.

After a detailed discusison of regional problems, the sides arrived at the common conclusion that regional conflicts were undermining international security, were fraught with grave consequences and called for the earliest collective settlement by political means and involving most actively the possibilities and mechanisms of the United Nations.

The sides gave an all-around analysis to the current situation in the Middle East and expressed solidarity with the courageous struggle of the Palestinian people for

their legitimate national rights, including the right to self-determination. They emphasized that the fair settlement of the Palestinian issue was the key aspect of the comprehensive Arab-Israeli conflict and that an international Middle East peace conference was the only way toward such a settlement and a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Eduard Shevardnadze told 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid about the Soviet Union's view of the peace conference as well as its tasks and goals. He stressed that the conference should be prepared, and prepared seriously on a collective basis.

The ministers exchanged views on the possibility of coordinating actions to step up the convocation of the UN-sponsored international conference with the participation of the UN Security Council permanent members and all sides involved in the conflict, including the Arab people of Palestine and the PLO as their legitimate representative.

The sides paid considerable attention to the Iran-Iraq conflict and the situation in the Persian Gulf which is a source of deep concern for the international community. Escalation of hostilities is no way to peace. The only right approach is the war's immediate end and political talks with the aim of reaching the conflict's earliest and comprehensive settlement. Besides, the UN Security Council Resolution 598, whose possibilities are far from being exhausted, provides a proper international legal basis for such a settlement.

'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid welcomed the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan and spoke in favor of their strict observance. The sides noted that the experience of the political settlement in Afghanistan could be used in resolving other regional conflicts.

Other international issues, including the situation in the Horn of Africa, were discussed.

The ministers spoke in favor of intensifying the established practice of political consultations, including those held by foreign ministries. Such an approach will consolidate the two countries' cooperation in improving international situation and finding positive solutions to global and regional problems.

Taking part in the talks from the Soviet side were: Yu. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, V. Polyakov, member of the Collegium of the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry, and G. Zhuravlyov, Soviet ambassador to Egypt, from the Egyptian side—M. 'Abd al-Razzaq, deputy foreign minister, M. Fathi, head of the East European Department of Egypt's Foreign Ministry, and Salah al-Din Hasan Basyuni, Egypt's ambassador to the Soviet Union.

A Soviet-Egyptian communique adopted at the talks' end will be published in the press.

The ministers signed an intergovernmental agrement between the USSR and Egypt on economic, trade, scientific, and technical cooperation. The signing ceremony was attended by A.F. Dobrynin, CPSU Central Committee secretary; G.G. Vedernikov, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman; and leaders of a number of ministries and departments.

Shevardnadze Dinner Speech

PM2305112988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 May 1988 Second Edition pp 4,5

[TASS report under the headline "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, 20 May gave a dinner for 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and foreign minister of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

The dinner was attended by Anatoliy Dobrynin, CPSU Central Committee secretary, Gennadiy Vedernikov, a deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials on the Soviet side and by officials accompanying 'Abd al-Majid on the Egyptian side.

Addressing the guest, Shevardnadze said:

Cordially greeting you here in Moscow, Mr Minister, I am glad to note that your visit is good news for our countries and peoples and a very notable landmark in Soviet-Egyptian relations. After in interval of more than ten years, a high-ranking Egyptian representative is visiting here again as a guest of the Soviet Government.

This attests to the vitality of friendly ties between our states. In the Soviet Union we have not forgotten that Egypt has been among the first countries in Africa and the Arab world, with which our country has formed diplomatic relations. These will soon be 45 years old. Your visit ahead of this anniversary lends it special significance.

We do not close our eyes to the past which has not always been cloudless, but the Soviet people have always had good feelings about Egypt and the Egyptians and this feeling marks our thoughts about the future as well.

The rich legacy of good and wide-ranging cooperation is a dependable basis for optimism, the more so as the horizon of Soviet-Egyptian relations has lately cleared markedly. We owe this perestroyka, or change, in our ties to substantial political dialogue started between Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and President Husni Mubarak.

Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with you, Mr Minister, has imparted a new quality to our bilateral relationship.

By joint effort, we have been seeking, and doing so successfully, to create such a model of contacts as would open a broad perspective for its continued development. I am convinced that this should be of interest not only to the Soviet Union and Egypt. The growing dynamism of international life sharpens the general view on the nature of contacts between nations, peoples and political forces capable of jointly influencing the state of affairs in this or that region. The obvious trend of improvement in the international climate is conducive to resolving acute international problems.

Right are those who see a relationship between the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and the signature of the Geneva agreements on a political settlement relating to Afghanistan as well as advances in many other areas of world politics.

Where such progress is held up, we seek to clear the way for it by concerted action with other countries.

I am talking about the Middle East, the "solar plexus" of the Arab world. Continuing blows to it cannot but be felt painfully in Egypt as well.

The Soviet approach to a Middle East settlement was recently expounded by Mikhail Gorbachev in detail once again. Its gist is that the balance of strength should be replaced by a balance of mutual interests. It is only on this basis, consistently abiding by the principles of equality and equal security, that it is possible to reach the desired aim.

The historical experience of efforts for peace argues not only for firmness and patience, it calls also for using flexibility, realism, and readiness to recognize and reckon with the lawful rights of the opponent.

The right of one and the rightlessness of another will never coexist. One cannot uphold one's rights by flouting the rights of the Arabs, occupying their lands and denying the Palestinian people the right to self-determination.

A vicious circle has emerged before the eyes of the world: confrontation heightens mutual mistrust day after day and the dearth of trust, for its part, forms an insurmountable barrier to talks.

The vicious circle cannot be broken by isolated and uncoordinated actions. These should be united to become systematic.

This is why the Soviet Union has been so persistent in its calls for collective international efforts and advocates preparing for and convening an international conference on the Middle East, to be attended by all sides concerned, including the PLO, and the permanent members of the UN Security Council.

We are convinced that should it be convened, this conference would offer a unique chance for the Arabs and Israel to sit down at the negotiating table and discuss, on a bilateral and multilateral footing, all contentious issues and find mutually acceptable solutions to them within the framework of a comprehensive and fair settlement. The Security Council permanent members, acting independently and collectively, would help the sides to clear the hurdles of mistrust and reach agreements supported and guaranteed by the authority of the international community.

An analysis of the present situation in the Middle East leads us to this conclusion: There are serious prerequisites for starting the process of a practical settlement. These are inherent in the general recognition of the obvious fact that this state of things cannot continue any longer.

We do not close our eyes, of course, to deep disagreements between the conflicting sides. We take into account also what are, both by their substance and by their form, different views on the content of a settlement and on what kind of conference it should be. But we are keenly aware at the same time that there is no way other than a political one to settle the Middle East conflict. To renounce banking on force and start a real quest for peace at the international conference is a categorical imperative of the times. Time has come in the Middle East to break the inertia of old thinking and turn decisively from confrontation to civilized communication and cooperation between states and peoples.

The Soviet Union is prepared to contribute to this and constructively interact with the other members of the Security Council, with the Arabs, with Israel and with everyone who can promote the cause of peace in the Middle East. We count on a contribution of its own to this great cause being made also by Egypt whose role in the fate of the region we are far from being prone to underestimate.

We hold what are in many ways similar views on another sensitive ganglion—the Iran-Iraq war. It is imperative to step up international efforts for an early realization of the UN Security Council's Resolution 598 and give every kind of support for the mission of the UN secretary-general.

The historic Geneva agreements on a political settlement relating to Afghanistan became effective a few days ago. Soviet troops began to be withdrawn from Afghanistan on May 15. We shall unswervingly adhere to our commitments, but we are entitled to expect the other parties to the agreement to follow its spirit and letter strictly as well. Afghanistan should become a really independent, neutral and nonaligned state.

Availing myself of this opportunity, I would like to express the hope that all states, especially Arab and Muslim ones, will give all assistance they can to achieving peace and national reconciliation in Afghanistan. The experience of Afghanistan should serve as a good and encouraging example for settling other regional conflicts and demonstrate that goodwill and readiness for sensible compromises can help to defuse them.

Your current stay in Moscow, Mr Minister, has been fairly brief but we hope that the practical returns on the talks held here will be significant.

Relations between our countries are being freed from the negative depositions of the past. Thanks to the efforts of the Soviet leadership and President Husni Mubarak, much has already been achieved.

These relations are now entering the phase of active cooperation which does not affect the interests of third countries. We would like to hope that waiting for us in the future is fruitful creative interaction in the spirit of the fine traditions that we remember so warmly today.

In conclusion Shevardnadze wished sound health and happiness to the Egyptian foreign minister and all Egyptian guests and peace and prosperity to the Egyptian people.

'Abd al-Majid Dinner Speech

PM2305113988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 May 1988 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the headline "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of foreign affairs, today gave a dinner in honor of 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt here on an official visit.

Eduard Shevardnadze spoke at the dinner.

In his reply speech, 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid said that he was very happy and flattered by the kind invitation to visit the delightful capital of the Soviet Union. This visit is a realization of my dream, he continued. It is for this reason that I would like, first and foremost, to express the sincere feelings of gratitude for the grand and friendly reception, your cordial hospitality and attention. With all my heart, I am grateful to you for the kind words about our country, about the close relations which bind it with your great state.

I am proud that my visit comes at a time when our cooperation with your friendly country has again returned into the channel of stable and balanced development in most diverse fields. We are bound with the Soviet Union by the strongest historical ties. We will not forget the support your country gave to Egypt at the various stages of our national struggle, of gaining economic independence.

It is also a great honor for me to pay tribute to the positive attitude of the Soviet Union to the settlement of our debt problems, to give a high appraisal to the jointly-elaborated principles which serve as a basis for bilateral cooperation in all fields. These principles are called upon to further expand the scope for the development of relations between our states.

The Egyptian diplomacy aims to exert persistent efforts to promote peace and security on the basis of justice, respect for national sovereignty and the legitimate rights of all states and nations. We know that in these matters the Soviet Union acts exactly from these positions.

My visit offers a great possibility for jointly examining the events that are taking place around and between us, to reassert the spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation, characteristic of our efforts in tackling international problems and bilateral issues.

The Soviet Union advances the concept of new political thinking, which espouses accord, understanding, and openness. This found reflection in a series of consistent positive initiatives in the field of disarmament and in building a nuclear-free world. They led to the signing of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty, and brought about other positive trends in this field. We see it as a good sign that inspires optimism and belief in a better future, in which all weapons threatening mankind's security will be destroyed.

For our part, we also strive for the era of accord to triumph in the world, and for the funds, which the two great powers channeled into the manufacture of weapons of destruction, to be used to develop civilization and promote mankind's prosperity.

Basing ourselves on exactly this approach, we are cooperating with all peaceloving states in the interests of solving international problems in keeping with the norms of international law and the UN resolutions. Egypt believes that the world is indivisible, that it can exist only on the basis of justice. This world does not mean at all the preservation of the status quo or giving in to force and rudeness. The force certainly can be used to impose a "fait accompli" but not to reach the truth and peace.

Egypt always believed that genuine peace in the Middle East was not possible unless there was a complete and just settlement of the Palestine problem, which is at the heart of the Middle Eastern conflict. For a long time it has warned those who hope that in the course of time they will be able to make people resign themselves to the fait accompli. At the same time they forget that the rights of the people to the native land are not consigned to

oblivion, are not abolished under the statute of limitations. The people, who were evicted from their land and are currently subjected to brutal terror and repressions on the part of Israeli troops which use an array of weapons and arbitrariness, will certainly gain the right to self-determination, to their native land.

As the idea of convening an international conference on the Middle East is meeting with growing international recognition, the Soviet Union, as a great power with a vital role in working out ways of settling all international and regional problems, is called upon to bear its responsibility with regard to this problem. Within the framework of talks with the Soviet Union, Egypt is prepared to discuss ideas, views, and proposals on this issue with the aim of creating favourable conditions and removing obstacles which hamper the convocation of an international peace conference.

Diplomacy is stepping up efforts to bring an end to the devastating war in the Persian Gulf, to fulfill all provisions of [UN] Security Council Resolution 598. The entire world community is called upon to join in preventing the war from extending its boundaries, from spilling over into the remaining part of this region, which is important for the security and well-being of the entire world.

Egypt welcomed the decision to withdraw troops from Afghanistan and hopes that the Afghan people will receive an opportunity themselves to decide their problems without any interference from outside, to opt for the kind of government they want. Egypt also pins hopes on the success of the efforts aimed at restoring Afghanistan's economy, creating conditions for the return of Afghan refugees there.

I would like to pay tribute to our joint steps with regard to the debt problem which proves a heavy burden for the fraternal African countries and other Third World states. I am convinced that the Soviet Union will spare no effort to "heal" this acute problem, whose solution calls for stepping up the joint efforts of the entire world community.

I will also point to the common policy of our two countries in condemning the policy of the South African racist regime. This policy is based on repressions against the heroic African people, whom the South African regime deprived of political and civil rights provided for under international law. The racist government in Pretoria continues to decide the fate of the people of Namibia, rejects the decisions of the United Nations and the Security Council on giving to this people freedom, independence and the right to be masters of their national wealth. You, probably, know with what trust Egypt views the important role played by the United Nations and its agencies in the questions of ensuring peace, justice and development. This support stems from our respect for the UN Charter, its constructive contribution to giving aid to the nations in need.

The past few years entered quite a few bright pages into the annals of fruitful cooperation between our countries. Until now our people feel gratitude for assistance in political, military, economic, cultural and technical fields. [This and a later addition is carried by Moscow TASS in English at 1851 GMT on 20 May in a similar report. Here TASS adds: "There is no doubt that this aid helped us through many trials on the long road of development."]

Even today as we enter a new stage of friendship, based on a durable foundation of political orientation and effective will, let us strive for dialogue for the sake of strengthening our cooperation, consolidating relationship and their consequent development.

Egypt is fulfilling a daring program of economic reform, aimed at implementing sound economic projects and rectifying structural disproportions. At the same time it remains loyal to the means and methods, which take into account the consequences of political and social nature, lead to easing the plight of the broad mass of Egyptian people.

In this context Egypt welcomes Soviet participation in the projects envisaged under the current 5-year plan for economic development. [TASS adds: "Priority in this respect is given to projects for developing infrastructure and ensuring food security."]

I am convinced that the signing of the agreement on economic, trade, scientific and technological cooperation, which provides for the creation of a mixed intergovernmental commission, will give fresh impetus to developing relations between our countries, will help run, modernize and expand industrial plants, built with Soviet assistance and which are the mainstay of Egyptian industry.

The signing in December last year of a long-term trade agreement between our countries provides for increasing trade turnover in the next 3 years, for encouraging barter deals, boosting deliveries of Soviet goods to Egypt and, consequently, of Egyptian goods to the Soviet Union.

In cultural cooperation Egypt always favored and favors stronger relations with the Soviet Union. This was reflected in the protocol on cultural and scientific cooperation extended for another 2 years, let alone the important protocols on cooperation in tourism and sports.

In conclusion, allow me, dear friends, the guest said, to greet you once again and convey to you, the leadership and the peoples of the great Soviet Union greetings from the leadership and the people of Egypt. We are convinced that our friendship of many years will be strengthened for the benefit of prosperity of our great peoples, in the interests of peace, security and well-being of all countries in the world.

The dinner passed in a friendly atmosphere.

Joint Communique

PM2305093188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 May 1988 Second Edition p 4

["Joint Soviet-Egyptian Communique"]

[Text] Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, was on an official visit in the Soviet Union from May 19 to May 21 this year at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The distinguished Egyptian guest laid a wreath to the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Wall.

The Egyptian deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs was received by Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary. Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid delivered to Mikhail Gorbachev a personal message from Arab Republic of Egypt President Husni Mubarak.

Talks were held between Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, USSR foreign minister, and Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, in whose course views were exchanged on Soviet-Egyptian relations and key international issues. The talks proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding.

Eduard Shevardnadze briefed the distinguished Egyptian guest on the substance of the current stage in the perestroyka drive in the Soviet Union, which is aimed, in accordance with the line charted at the 27th CPSU Congress, at accelerating the country's socioeconomic development on the basis of a radical economic reform, a broad drive for more democracy and renewal in all areas of the Soviet society's life. He spoke about the practical steps undertaken by the Soviet Union for firmly asserting new political thinking in international relations.

Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid wished the Soviet people every success in the perestroyka drive, pointed out the great interest in Egypt in the large-scale fundamental reforms currently underway in the Soviet Union. He spoke highly of the USSR's peaceable [mirolyubivaya] foreign policy which exerts an effective influence on the improvement in the international climate.

In examining the state and perspectives of Soviet-Egyptian relations, the sides pointed out with satisfaction the noticeable positive change taking place in them. They reaffirmed the mutual wish for further developing these relations, strengthening mutual understanding and cooperation in various fields.

The great significance was stressed of political dialogue, which makes it possible to exchange views on various aspects of bilateral relations, of the most important international problems. The sides have agreed to carry on consultations between the foreign ministreis of the two countries on issues of mutual interest.

A detailed discussion of bilateral economic relations was held. Proceeding from the need for their strengthening, the sides signed an agreement on economic, trade and scientific-technical cooperation providing for the setting up of a mixed intergovernmental commission.

The sides at the talks were unanimous that the signing of that agreement coincides with an important stage of the economic development of both countries and opens up broad prospects for mutually benefitial bilateral cooperation. The sides stressed the significance of the application of such new forms of cooperation as the implementation of joint projects and setting up joint ventures. In examining other aspects of relations between the USSR and Egypt the sides declared for a further development of interparliamentary ties, for broadening exchanges in the field of culture, science and other fields, which will contribute toward deepening mutual confidence and strengthening ties between the peoples of the two countries.

In examining the situation in the world, the sides pointed to the need for contributing in every way possible to the current positive change in the international arena in the interests of strengthening universal peace and security. In that connection they stressed that the resolution of the key issue—eliminating the nuclear threat and preserving civilization, building a nuclear-free and non-violent world—necessitate vigorous efforts by all states, irrespective of their political, economic and social system, the geographical position.

The Egyptian side was briefed on the specific steps made by the Soviet Union for implementing the program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere, and with the Soviet appraisal of the state of things at the current disarmament talks, prospects for reaching new agreements in that field.

The sides were unanimous that the treaty signed between the USSR and the U.S. in December 1987 on the elimination of their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is a history-making event. They expressed the hope that the treaty opens up the way toward concluding other agreements, lowering the level of nuclear confrontation and creating prerequisites for a broad and dynamic process of real disarmament, and that new steps in this direction will be made at the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow.

The participants in the talks stand for the discontinuance of nuclear weapon testing and the conclusion of an international agreement on a complete and comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons, for using outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

The sides pointed out the importance of energetic efforts, within the framework of the disarmament conference in Geneva, to conclude a convention on a ban on the development, manufacture, accumulation and use of chemical weapons and their elimination, and at other international forums working on disarmament issues.

The parties to the talks stated their support for proposals to set up nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world, including the Middle East.

The sides emphasized the insistent need for seeking stronger universal peace and security and implementation of relevant UN General Assembly decisions.

In this connection, the sides expressed the hope for a success of the 3d special General Assembly session on disarmament, which is called upon to become an important landmark along the path of achieving complete and general disarmament under effective international control.

Shevardnadze spoke highly of Egypt's constructive line on disarmament issues and of its contribution to efforts to remove the nuclear threat and ensure peace and international security.

The sides voiced serious concern over the persistence and aggravation of regional conflicts which have a negative effect on the international situation.

They proceed from the need to achieve an early settlement of these conflicts through peaceful means, in accordance with the UN Charter, with a view to relaxing tensions, strengthening universal peace and security, and building up trust among states.

There was a comprehensive discussion of the current situation in the Middle East. They supported the Palestinian people in occupied territories, who had come out against Israeli occupation, and resolutely condemned Israel's inhuman actions against defenseless Palestinian people, the forced deportation of Palestinians carried out by Israel, the practice of political assassinations and state terrorism.

The sides confirmed the need for taking urgent practical measures to achieve a just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East on the basis of a withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territories occupied since 1967—the West Bank of the Jordan River, the Gaza Strip and the Syrian Golan Heights, and the ensurance of legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including its inalienable right to self-determination.

In this connection, the sides confirmed that an international conference, to be convened under the aegis of the United Nations with the participation of permanent members of the Security Council and all parties to the Middle East conflict concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, offered an efficient mechanism for searching for mutually acceptable solutions on all aspects of the Middle East conflict.

The participants in the talks noted that propitious prerequisites had been shaping up of late for convening an international conference and starting a peaceful process.

The sides exchanged opinions on a possibility for coordinating efforts with a view to convening the conference and ensuring its success.

In discussing the Iran-Iraq conflict the sides expressed concern about the fact that the continuation and escalation of the war adversely affects security not only in the Persian Gulf, but international security on the whole. They insist on the need for the immediate implementation in full of UN Security Council Resolution 598, which is a just and balanced basis for a political settlement, and also point out the importance of contributing in every way possible to the efforts by the UN secretary general.

The sides have reaffirmed their support for Lebanon's territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence and declared for a strict observance of UN Security Council Resoltution 425.

The Egyptian deputy prime minister welcomed the Geneva accords on Afghanistan.

The sides declared for a strict observance of the Geneva accords and expressed confidence that a settlement of the Afghanistan problem could serve as a model for unblocking other regional conflicts.

In a comprehensive examination of European security issues, special attention was devoted to security in the area of the Mediterranean. The sides expressed support for the proposals on turning the Mediterranean into a zone of stable peace, security and cooperation.

Both sides expressed profound concern about the situation in southern Africa. They strongly condemned the apartheid policy pursued by the RSA regime and urged the international community to build up efforts in support of the struggle waged by the people of Namibia under the SWAPO leadership for immediately granting independence to it on the basis of the corresponding resolutions of the UN General Assembly. They expressed solidarity with the "Frontline" States of southern Africa, condemned Pretoria's aggressive policy vis-a-vis those states, the occupation by it of a part of Angola's territory, stressed the need for imposing all embracing and mandatory sanctions against the RSA regime.

The sides expressed concern about the growing debt of the African states threatening socioeconomic development and progress of those countries, and declared the

need for a search for a just settlement of that problem on the basis of the corresponding decisions of the UN and the Organization of African Unity.

The sides pointed out the growing role of the Nonaligned Movement in major international and regional affairs and the positive contribution made by the Nonaligned Movement to maintaining and strengthening peace, implementing real disarmament and building fair fundamentals of a new economic order ensuring the attainment by all states of the goals of socioeconomic development for the benefit of universal peace and international security.

The sides at the talks declared the need for enhancing the role of the United Nations Organization in all fields of its activities for implementing the principles and objectives of the UN Charter in the interests of all states of the world.

The sides exchanged views on the key issues of the present-day international economic relations, stressed the importance of their restructuring on a just, democratic basis in the spirit of the respective decisions of the United Nations Organization.

The sides expressed satisfaction with the results of the official visit to the Soviet Union of the deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

The distinguished Egyptian guest expressed profound gratitude to the USSR minister of foreign affairs, the Government and people of the Soviet Union for the hospitality accorded to him and the delegation accompanying him.

Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid extended an invitation to Eduard Shevarndadze to go on an official visit to Egypt. The invitation was accepted with gratitude and the time of the visit will be agreed upon at a later date through diplomatic channels.

Dubinin Elaborates Stand on Mideast Settlement

TA1905151988 Tel Aviv 'AL HAMISHMAR in Hebrew 19 May 88 pp 1, 2

[Report by Dalya Shehori and U.S. correspondent Dalya Refa'el]

[Excerpts] Washington—The Soviets have dropped their demand for an authoritative and coercive international conference, as well as a continuing conference during the peace negotiations. This information was relayed by sources in the foreign minister's entourage, following Peres' meeting with Soviet Ambassador Yuriy Dubinin, last Tuesday night. [passage omitted]

Dubinin prefaced his remarks by saying that the missile pact with the United States and the agreement on the withdrawal from Afghanistan are proof that the Soviets want a solution to regional conflicts and an improved world atmosphere. He added that the Soviet Union regards other regional problems in the same spirit. He assured Israel that Moscow is willing and determined to act on a solution in the Middle East. Dubinin said he was satisfied with the lack of skepticism in Peres' remarks over this matter.

"As a superpower with comprehensive responsibility, and as the region's neighbor, the Soviet Union would like to see a settlement in the Middle East," said Dubinin. He also noted the Soviet Union's concern over the recent introduction of tactical missiles and chemical warheads into the area.

Dubinin dictated the Soviet stand from a written document:

Self-determination for the Palestinians, although this can be implemented in the framework of a confederation.

Each party's security requirements.

Nonintervention in all countries' interior affairs.

Regard for the sovereignty of all countries.

Abstaining from using force in settling conflicts.

The basis for a territorial settlement—Resolutions 242 and 338, and the principle of territories for peace.

The best mechanism for the conflict's solution—an international conference.

The legal basis—the acceptance of Resolutions 242 and 338 by all parties concerned.

Representation will be granted to all parties to the conflict, including Palestinian Arabs.

The negotiations will be conducted in three forums: the conference plenum; multipartite groups for discussing regional conflicts; and bipartite groups, with the participation of Israel and its neighbors, for solving the conflict between them.

The Security Council permanent members' role will be to create "an atmosphere conducive to negotiations."

The Soviet Union accepts the possibility of interim stages in solving the conflict, as long as they relate to the final settlement.

After the presentation of the Soviet stand, the issues were discussed. Minister Peres explained why the Soviet self-determination formula (which means, in fact, the establishment of a Palestinian state) cannot be accepted by Israel. Referring to the Soviet proposal, Peres also suggested that the Soviets omit several clauses unacceptable to the parties, which will "merely delay the process." The sources have not specified which clauses Minister Peres meant. [passage omitted]

KUNA Cites Soviet, Israeli Conference Talks

LD2305095188 Kuwait KUNA in English 0904 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 23 (KUNA)—The Soviet Union said Monday that recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people is in the forefront of its concern in the collective search for a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

In a statement to KUNA, an official Soviet source explained that the essence of the Soviet initiative is the invitation of all concerned parties to a constructive dialogue on the convocation of an international conference to formulate a just peace in the region taking into consideration the interests of all parties to the conflict.

It is because of this objective that the Soviet Union was contacting Israeli representatives, especially the Labour Party "which, despite its genuine reservations, is agreeing to the idea of an international conference on the Middle East crisis," the source said in the statement transmitted via the official Soviet NOVOSTI Agency.

The source was elaborating on the attitude of Moscow towards the Soviet-American dialogue on settlement of the Middle East conflict and the speculations and rumours that coupled the statement of the Israeli Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres on his meeting with the Soviet delegation that attended the Socialist International [SI] in Madrid on May 10-12.

The session in Madrid failed in condemning the Zionist practices against the Palestinians and Lebanese despite protests from Arab delegates including leader of the Lebanese Socialist Party Walid Junblatt.

The Soviet observer delegates, including those on the Middle East Committee, held a series of unofficial talks with the leader of the Israeli Labour Party Shim'on Peres and leader of Mapam Party on the fringes of the Madrid conference to inquire about the labour Party's willingness to show flexibility in the search for settlement of the Middle East conclict through an international conference, the Soviet source said.

In their talks with Peres, the Soviet representatives highlighted fulfillment of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people including their right to establishment of their independent state and other matters on organisation of the international conference, he said.

Furthermore, the Soviet delegation on the SI strongly condemned Israel's repressive practices against the Palestinian Arabs in the occupied territories and the state terrorism demonstrated in the assassination of the deputy commander of the Palestinian revolutionary forces Khalil al-Wazir and the recent Israeli aggression on Lebanon, he added.

The Soviet source said that as co-ruling in the coalition government of Israel, the Labour Party shoulders some of the responsibility for such practices which conflict with statements of the party leaders on their efforts to reconcile with the Arabs and their hopes to check the influence of the fanatic rightist forces in Israel.

Moscow has said that it was ready to resume diplomatic relations with Israel, broken over Israel's aggression on the Arab states in 1967, the day the international conference on the Middle East crisis opens sitting.

East Europe

Further on MSZMP Conference Proceedings

LD2205200588 Moscow TASS in English 1915 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] Budapest May 22 TASS—TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kuzmin reports:

The All-Hungary party conference ends its work in Budapest today. Its delegates, representing over 800,000-strong army of Hungarian Communists, discussed the results of the country's development over the past years, the party's tasks in the present-day stage of socialist development, measures for overcoming unfavourable tendencies in the socio-economic sphere, questions of further perfection of the system of political institutes.

The "turning-point", "reform" and "renovation" notions determined the main content of the speeches made by participants in the forum. Speakers put forward many proposals aimed at consolidating the socialist gains, strengthening the party ranks. Criticism of errors made and drawbacks in the party's work was made in a businesslike and constructive spirit. Communists reaffirmed that they would continue resolving socio-economic development tasks, which grew more complicated, in close unity around the party, while steadily deepening socialist democracy and broadening public openness.

It was noted that the Hungarian people needs peace for creative labour. Underlined in this connection was the significance of the USSR's new approach to solution of cardinal international questions, the importance of changes taking place in different spheres of life of the Land of the Soviets.

Summing up the results of the discussion, Janos Kadar said that the party conference fulfilled the tasks set to it. The discussion at the conference testified to the Communists high responsibility for the future of the country, their readiness to direct their effort at solving the tasks that were set. The main conclusion of the conference is that the Hungarian people is fully determined to continue advancing along the lines of socialist development. It is particularly important now to renew methods of work in line with the requirements of the times, to

enhance the significance of the Communists' own example, to draw all Hungarian socialists into the process of taking decisions and controlling their implementation. The Hungarian people, Janos Kadar underlined, is strengthening friendship and alliance with the USSR, other countries of the socialist community. We face many tasks. The Hungarian people has an efficient party, ready for renovation, the party which enjoys support of society.

The delegates passed a resolution of the conference which assesses the situation in the country, outlines the party's tasks for further consolidating of its guiding role, expansion of inter-party democracy, raising of efficiency of activities of the system of political institutions. The resolution underlines the significance of developing cooperation of the Hungarian People's Republic with the Soviet Union, other Warsaw Treaty states, the significance of the consistent struggle for peace and disarmament in our planet.

The conference this evening will elect new steering bodies of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party—the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission.

Kadar Addresses Conference

LD2005181188 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 20 May 88

[Text] Budapest May 20 TASS—Topical questions of Hungary's further advance along the road of socialist construction, the role of Communists in resolving new tasks of social and economic development, questions of upgrading the functioning of the system of political institutions are discussed by representatives of more than 800 thousand Hungarian Communists at an All-Hungary party conference that opened in Budapest today.

Addressing the conference, General Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Janos Kadar assessed in a positive way the results of a nationwide debate on the draft resolution of the forum. "A clear-cut picture of the main direction of our further advance should, above all, be shown at the party conference", he said. "The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party is exerting the efforts to achieve the historic aim of the working class—the construction of socialist society. Fruitful continuation of the construction of socialist society in Hungary is the starting point and aim of all the decisions of the party, the meaning and essence of its activity. The strength and firmness of people's power largely depend on the effective functioning of the system of political institutions. The party see the need for the further upgrading of the political system of our society. The steering role of a Marxist-Leninist party is needed throughout a prolonged historic period of socialist construction. In the interests of fuller implementation of its historic mission, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' party is prepared for renewal suiting the requirements of the present situation. It decisively took the road of reforms and democracy. The Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party firmly declared in support of socialist democracy, self-government, citizens' initiatives, for the widening of openness."

Janos Kadar said that the results of the work of the Hungarian people largely depend on the development of international politics, on the shaping of international relections. Hungary now has a good reputation abroad, he said. This reputation is based on the results achieved, on actual steps for the renewal of socialist practice, and, naturally, on Hungary's international activity.

"We witness the renewal of socialism. The entire world socialist system approached a new, higher stage of development. Processes of renewal that were started in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are of huge importance, since openness, consideration for actual situation are characteristic of them, which is of priority importance for the solution of tasks. We, Hungarian Communists, regard this above all as the evidence of the fact that we are advancing in the mainstream of socialist development. The processes of reforms taking place in Hungary have become an organic part of the development of socialism.

"Due to the initiatives of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, the international situation has favourably changed. We welcome the Soviet-American talks, the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles signed in Washington, the talks on 50-per cent cuts in strategic offensive arms."

"The new Soviet-American summit will open in Moscow in a few days' time. The Hungarian people together with all peace forces of the globe believe that the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, the countries that have a great impact on the shaping of the destinies of humanity, will be able to take a step forward on the path they have started, to achieve reciprocal and equal security at a lower level of armaments, to ensure peace which is the most important external condition for constructive work of our people", the general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party said in conclusion.

Grosz, Kadar Take New Posts

LD2305121288 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] A Hungarian Party conference has ended in Budapest. For 3 days the conference held the attention of everybody in Hungary. The governing Socialist Workers' Party discussed the ways of solving the grave economic problems that face the nation, and also drastic economic and political reforms and the role of Communists in renewing society. Our Budapest correspondent elaborates:

[Unidentified correspondent] The reform of the Hungarian economy that began 20 years ago has never been even—it would now accelerate, now slow down. When in 1986 the situation on the external markets took a notable change for the worse, the change pained the nation's open economy. Some Hungarian goods lost their competitiveness, the growth of labor productivity lags far behind the level of society's wellbeing. The foreign debt ballooned up to $18 billion, fueling both the national budget deficit and the prices of key staple goods.

It was noted in the conference by both party leaders and rank and file Communists that most of the difficulties were rooted in Hungary's own mistakes. The success achieved in the past made many complacent. Discipline on the job and public control went lax, and subjectivism took root in economic management and other fields of society's activity. The Communists and all other people of Hungary discussed what they had to do to cope with the shortcomings and reach a new level of work. Hundreds of thousands of proposals were sent to the party's Central Committee; many of them were used to prepare the conference resolutions.

So what decisions did the Hungarian party conference adopt, a conference that took place in an atmosphere of openness and critical analysis? The decisions are aimed at renewing the party; more accurately dividing the functions and responsibilities among the party, government and local governing bodies; making the Hungarian parliament more independent; promoting the multimandate electoral system; and regularly holding nationwide and local referendums on all the key questions. There will also be changes in the party election system.

The conference elected a new Central Committee. At its first fullscale meeting, the Central Committee elected members of the Political Bureau and the Central Committee's Secretariat. Janos Kadar was elected party chairman. Karoly Grosz, who 1 year ago was appointed prime minister, was elected to the post of general secretary.

Gorbachev Congratulates Grosz

PM2305112188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[Gorbachev message congratulating new MSZMP General Secretary Karoly Grosz]

[Text] To Comrade Karoly Grosz, MSZMP general secretary

Dear Comrade Grosz!

Please accept my sincere congratulations in connection with your election as MSZMP general secretary.

You are well known in the Soviet Union as a principled Communist and authoritative leader of socialist Hungary, and your vigorous activity to deepen fraternal friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the USSR and Hungary is highly valued.

I sincerely wish you, Comrade Grosz, great success in your responsible new post in solving tasks of improving and renewing socialist society on Hungarian soil. I am sure our fraternal parties will continue to actively exchange experience and collaborate in joint matters.

M. Gorbachev

Greets New Chairman Kadar

PM2305104188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[Gorbachev message congratulating new MSZMP Chairman Janos Kadar]

[Text] To Comrade Janos Kadar, MSZMP chairman

Dear Comrade Kadar!

In connection with your election to the post of MSZMP chairman, I convey to you sincere congratulations and friendly greetings.

I wish you, prominent figure of the international communist and workers movement, convinced internationalist and Leninist, and loyal friend of our country, great successes in your work for the benefit of people's Hungary and the cause of peace and socialism. I am convinced that the fraternal alliance between the CPSU and the MSZMP will continue to be a reliable guarantee of inviolable friendship between our countries and peoples.

I wish you health, happiness, and prosperity.

M. Gorbachev

Grosz Profiled

PM2305124188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 May 88 Second Edition pp 1,3

[Profile of "Karoly Grosz, MSZMP general secretary and Hungarian Council of Ministers chairman"]

[Text] Karoly Grosz was born on 1 August 1930 in the city of Miskolc and comes from a long line of Communist workers. When he was 15 he started work as a typesetter. It was then that he joined the Hungarian Communist Party and became actively involved in its local organization's work.

In 1948 he was elected secretary of the Borsod County youth organization committee. From 1949 on he worked in the county committee and then in the party Central Committee. In 1950 he was sent to the Petofi officers'

academy for training and after graduation he served as a political worker in the Hungarian People's Army. In 1954 he was working on the Borshod party county committee again.

During the counterrevolutionary events in October 1956 he displayed principledness and resolution as an organizer of the rebuff to armed rebels in the county. For services in the defense of the people's democratic system he was awarded the "For Worker-Peasant Power" medal.

In 1958 he was appointed chief editor of the county paper ESZAK MAGYARORSZAG. From 1959 on he was also studying at the MSZMP Central Committee Higher Party School. After graduating he worked as Hungarian radio and television party committee secretary from 1962 to 1968. In the period 1968-1973 he was deputy chief of the MSZMP Central Committee Agitation and Propaganda Department. It was during that period that he completed an external degree at Budapest's L. Eotvos University.

In 1973 he was elected first secretary of the Fejer MSZMP county Committee. One year later he was appointed chief of the MSZMP Agitation and Propaganda Department.

During the period from 1979 to 1984 he was first secretary of Borsod MSZMP county Committee, in the country's biggest industrial region. In 1980 he became a member of the MSZMP Central Committee.

In December 1984 K. Grosz became first secretary of the Budapest MSZMP City Committee. At the 13th MSZMP Congress (March 1985) he was elected to the MSZMP Central Committee Politburo.

In June 1987 the National Assembly elected K. Grosz chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers. Under his leadership a program to stabilize the country's economic and social development has been eleborated and work to make the national economy better balanced, improve its structures, and solve social problems has been stepped up. As an active advocate of the consolidation of socialism's positions on Hungarian soil, K. Grosz has been consistently in favor of updating the party's activity at the present crucial stage, of strengthening its leading role, and of an innovative approach to the attainment of the set goals.

In all his posts K. Grosz has actively contributed to strengthening friendship and developing comprehensive cooperation between Hungary and the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. He has been to our country on several occasions.

At the MSZMP Central Committee Plenum after the Hungarian national party conference K. Grosz was elected general secretary of the MSZMP.

Grosz Interviewed on Economic Emphases

PM2005130988 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 21, 21-27 May 88 (Signed to Press 19 May) pp 2-3

[TASS correspondent B. Shestakov interview with Karoly Grosz, MSZMP Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, under the rubric "Hungarian National Party Conference Opens 20 May": "New Spirit of Reform"; date and place not given]

[Text] Question: Please tell us briefly about the first results of the government program of socioeconomic stabilization.

Answer: First of all I can say that the economy has shown definite signs of revival over the past 6 months—growth in industrial output, the national income, and exports to capitalist countries. This year began better than any year previously. For example, in January and February Hungarian exports to capitalist countries increased by more than 40 percent in comparison with the same period last year. It is true that the results achieved are somewhat lower than we would have liked, but they are results nevertheless.

Unfortunately, the emphasis on exports means that enterprises are sending abroad everything they possibly can, regardless of the price offered. Naturally, supplies for the population have shown no substantial improvement under these circumstances.

An important landmark was the 1 January introduction of the new taxation system (providing, in particular, for the progressive taxation of citizens and enterprises—Editor). On the whole it has been successful, as is shown by the economic revival and stability in supplies to the population. There were technical hitches at first, of course, but we had already predicted that this year would be a "learning process." I will add that the budget deficit has fallen by approximately 10 percent in comparison with the first 2 months of last year. These positive changes make us hopeful that we will be able to halt the burgeoning foreign debt in the near future. If this happens we will be halfway to winning the battle.

Another result is that there has been a very intensive start to economic processes which previously we could not get moving at all, however much we talked about reform. We have begun the modernization of the economic mechanism and drawn up a real schedule of what has to be done in this area by 1990. We have begun work on the draft Law on Economic Associations. This is a very important theoretical and practical task, at least as important as the new taxation system. We would like to submit this law for discussion by the National Assembly in September. To greatly simplify the issue, we are talking about legalizing the possibility to form enterprises combining state, cooperative, and private ownership.

We are thereby rectifying the fact that we had previously allowed ourselves to run too far ahead in the sphere of socialist political economy. The main thing is that for the first time we will be ensuring that amassed capital flows back into the economy, guaranteeing more harmonious interaction between enterprises through the production sphere, and, most important of all, we will be helping working people to feel that they are really in control. Experiments at the "Taurus" and "Medikor" enterprises, each of which has taken its own direction, have been crowned with great success, in our view. A great deal of controversy surrounds the future law, but we are confident that it will give the economy new strength.

Another measure aimed at improving economic efficiency is the liquidation of loss-making enterprises, which already has legal backing and allows the more free, more natural circulation of money and manpower.

We have also begun work on a wage reform, which is going to take a long time to complete. We are not just talking about eliminating the practice of wage-leveling—we also intend to review the old views on social policy. Wages are dependent on labor, and social policy issues must be decided accordingly, through payments and benefits taken from centralized state funds. Under the new system every citizen has the right to the basic social benefits, pension included. But if he wants to have more for his old age he can pay more now—in other words, he can essentially acquire the right to a comfortable existence in his old age.

We are pursuing many directions: In particular, we are making radical improvements in national economic planning and establishing the relationship between the market and the plan.

Finally, an important role in the realization of our program is played by the reorganization of the state-administrative apparatus. We are following two directions here: Decentralization and the transfer of administrative functions to the public. The size of the apparatus is being substantially reduced at the same time.

In short, we have done a great deal in the last 6 months. True, the reforms are still only scratching the surface, but we have introduced a new spirit and brought capable young people into responsible posts. I believe that on the whole we are gradually making progress in our program of socioeconomic development.

Question: Are the people who think that the press exaggerates the difficulties right?

Answer: On the whole journalists give an accurate picture of the situation, but at the moment their items do not reflect the first shoots of new ideas forging a path for themselves through negative trends and phenomena. There is no doubt that energy, patience, and persistency are needed to get out of the present situation. We must finish what we have started.

Question: What is the connection between restructuring in the Soviet Union and the process of renewal in Hungary, and what are the possibilities for the two countries to use each other's experience?

Answer: First, the overwhelming majority of Hungarian citizens are very sympathetic to the changes being made in the Soviet Union. I have worked in the party for 40 years but I cannot remember such sympathy for the USSR and its leaders, with the exception of the period after the liberation.

The process of renewal in the USSR differs from the Hungarian process because there economic and political reforms go hand in hand. In Hungary, on the other hand, economic reform began, then stopped, while political reforms are only just beginning. I do not agree with those who say that our economic reform has been unsuccessful because it has not been accompanied by political reform. No, the Hungarian reform stopped when it did because it was weakened by some economic decisions and because it had not been thought through in every aspect.

But, irrespective of this, the parallel implementation of two reforms in the USSR increases the chance of success, and this is an example for Hungary. And so I attach enormous significance to the process of political renewal in the USSR for the development of Hungarian political reform. Whereas, as it seems to me, the Hungarian reform has taken the lead in the economic sphere, the Soviet Union is ahead in the political sphere.

There is also another aspect that is not so direct. The new foreign policy thinking in the USSR means greater freedom of action for us and increases openness to the rest of the world.

CPCZ's Jakes Stops Over in Moscow

LD2205203688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] CPCZ Central Committee General Secretary Milos Jakes, on his way to official visits in the PRC, the DPRK, and Mongolia made a short stopover in Moscow today. Jakes was met and seen off at the airport by Comrade Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee secretary, senior staff of the CPSU Central Committee, and by [Jindrich] Rehorek, Czechoslovak ambassador to the USSR.

En route from Prague to Beijing, Jakes, CPCZ Central Committee general secretary, sent a telegram to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, from the aircraft. It says: While flying over the territory of the USSR, I am sending to you, to the CPSU Central Committee, to Soviet communists, and to all working people cordial greetings and wishes of great

success in implementing the restructuring of Soviet society. In the CSSR we shall do everything possible for the traditional relations of friendship, alliance, and all-around cooperation which exist between our parties, states, and peoples to continue to develop and to deepen in the future for the benefit of the peoples of the two fraternal countries and in the interest of progress and peace on the planet.

Political & Social

Armenia, Azerbaijan Party Chiefs Replaced

Armenian Appeal to Gorbachev

AU2005131988 Paris AFP in English 1303 GMT 20 May 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, May 20 (AFP)—A delegation of Armenians appealed Friday to the Soviet Supreme Court and the Soviet leadership for a full list of Armenians killed or injured in last February's ethnic clashes in Azerbaijan. The delegation, about 30 strong, handed in a letter to the Supreme Court signed by several prominent Armenian personalities calling for a detailed toll to be published in the national and regional press.

The letter, addressed to Soviet Communist Party General-Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, President Andrey Gromyko and the Director of Public Prosecutions, Alexander Rekunkov, also called for T.V. coverage of the trial in Sumgait, Azerbaijan of 80 people accused of taking part in the clashes. The signatories requested that two or three Armenian jurists be allowed to attend the trial and that the Armenian contingent on the magistrates bench be expanded "to make the proceedings fully impartial." The signatories included the chairmen of the Armenia Writers' Union, Grachia Oganessian, the Artists Union Ara Shiraz and the Film Producers association Sergey Israelian and the Union of Journalists Emmanuel Manukian.

Armenians present outside the Supreme Court showed reporters photocopies of six death certificates made out at the end of February and the beginning of March at Sumgait hospital. Two were dated March 4 and were those of two brothers, Albert and Valeri Avanessian. Both survived the war in Afghanistan only to be killed in the three days of riots which rocked the industrial city north of Baku, the Azerbaijan capital from February 27-29, friends said. [passage omitted]

Vezirov Replaces Bagirov

LD2105111588 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1056 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Baku, 21 May (TASS)—A plenum of the Central Committee of Azerbaijan was held today. It relieved Kyamran Bagirov from the duties of first secretary of the Central Committee.

Abdul Rakhman Vezirov was elected first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

Abdul Rakhman Vezirov was born in 1930. He graduated from the Azerbaijan industrial institute.

Between 1951 and 1970 he was involved in Komsomol work and between 1970 and 1976 in party work in Azerbaijan.

Since 1976, he has been involved in diplomatic work: consul general in the city of Calcutta, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary in Nepal, and later in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Arutyunyan Replaces Demirchyan

LD2105124388 Moscow TASS International Russian 1214 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Yerevan, 21 May (TASS)—A plenum of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee took place today. It relieved Karen Demirchyan of his duties as first secretary of the Central Committee.

Forty-nine year old Suren Arutyunyan, who previously held the post of first deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, was elected first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee.

Suren Arutyunyan was born in the family of a white-collar worker. He joined the ranks of the CPSU when he was 22. He graduated from the Yerevan Zoological Veterinary Institute, worked in the countryside, and then graduated from the "V.I. Lenin" Military-Political Academy in Moscow. He defended a thesis of candidate of philosophical sciences.

From 1962 Arutyunyan was in leading Komsomol work, and was secretary of the Lenin Komsomol Central Committee.

From 1978 he worked on the staff of the CPSU Central Committee. Four years ago he was appointed first deputy chairman of the republic's government.

In 1986 he was elected member of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and member of the Central Committee Bureau.

Arutyunyan was twice elected deputy to the republic's Supreme Soviet. He has had USSR orders and medals conferred on him.

Demonstrations Resume in Baku

AU2105161888 Paris AFP in English 1519 GMT 21 May 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, May 21 (AFP)—Azerbaijanis took to the streets of Baku Saturday in renewed demonstrations against Armenians, some of whom have started leaving the city over the past few days, a western source there said.

Demonstrations occurred as the Soviet media reported the dismissal of the leaders of the two neighbouring Soviet republics of Azerbaijan and Armenia following a week of fresh ethnic protests in both capitals of Baku and Yerevan.

Saturday's demonstration in Baku, on the Caspian sea, was organised by students who previously took to the streets on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, according to the source reached by telephone. [passage omitted]

Armenians Moving to Nagorno-Karabakh

AU2105201888 Paris AFP in English 2008 GMT 21 May 88

[Excerpts] Moscow, May 21 (AFP)—Armenians who fled Sumgait following massacres there last February are now going to live in the Armenian-dominated autonomous region of Nagorno-Karabakh, a part of Azerbaijan which Armenians want transferred to their own republic, the VECHERNAYA MOSKVA newspaper reported here Saturday. Quoting a representative of the Armenian republic in Moscow, Eduard Assaturovich, the newspaper also said that "hundreds" of Armenians had left Azerbaijan in the wake of the massacres and that, in turn, Azeris were leaving Armenia. [passage omitted]

Meanwhile a Western source in Baku, Azerbaijan, said Saturday that some Armenian families left the city this week, and some were pressured into leaving their jobs following renewed anti-Armenian agitation.

Renewed ethnic demonstrations which occurred in both Armenia and Azerbaijan last week are believed to have prompted the early dismissal, announced Saturday, of both leaders of the two neighbouring Soviet republics.

Armenians Demonstrate in Moscow

AU2205153088 Paris AFP in English 1435 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 22 (AFP)—About 300 Armenians, meeting at the Armenian cemetery here, on Sunday urged the Soviet media to break its silence on current events in Azerbaijan, particularly the town of Sumgait. They claimed that Sumgait—where ethnic rioting erupted in February and people accused of involvement are now on trial—had been cut off by security forces for the past three days.

A Communist Party official in Sumgait, reached by phone Sunday, denied that anything unusual was going on and described the situation as calm.

The demonstrators also called for the "real culprits", responsible for the February massacre of Armenians in Sumgait, to be brought to trial, including Kyamran Bagirov, the Azerbaijani Communist Party first secretary whose dismissal was announced Saturday. The current trial of people accused of taking part in the massacre was a "farce", demonstrators said, and they demanded that the name of all those killed be published by the press.

The Sumgait massacre left 26 Armenians and 6 Azeris dead and several hundred injured, according to an official toll. Unofficial estimates have suggested there were many more people killed. The massacre, on February 28 and 29, followed clashes between Armenians and Azeris in the Armenian-dominated autonomous region of Nagorno-Karabakh, a part of Azerbaijan which Armenians want to see annexed to their own republic.

Demonstrators here also paid tribute to the weekly MOSCOW NEWS which, they said, was the only press organ to report that the Sumgait massacre was planned and carried out with the help of members of the local militia.

Meanwhile Armenian sources said that police on Saturday arrested a number of Azeri students who took to the streets of Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan, in renewed ethnic demonstrations against Armenians living there. Demonstrations in Armenia and Azerbaijan last week are believed to have brought about Saturday's dismissal of the two leaders of both republics.

Yakovlev Addresses Armenian Plenum

PM2105161588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 May 88 First Edition p 2

[TASS report under general heading "Plenums Held"]

[Text] Yerevan, 21 May—A plenum of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee held today examined an organizational question.

The plenum relieved K.S. Demirchyan of the duties of first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee in connection with his retirement on pension owing to his state of health.

The plenum elected S.G. Arutyunyan, who has worked as first deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers and earlier as a section chief in the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, as first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee.

A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, and V.I. Dolgikh, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, took part in the plenum's work.

A.N. Yakovlev spoke at the plenum.

Ligachev Attends Azerbaijan Plenum

PM2105155888 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 May 88 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent Z. Kadymbekov report under general heading: "Plenums Held"]

[Text] Baku, 21 May—A plenum of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee held here has examined an organizational question. In connection with his retirement on pension owing to his state of health K.M. Bagirov was relieved of the duties of first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee. A. Kh. Vezirov, who worked hitherto as USSR Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, was elected first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, spoke at the plenum. G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, took part in the plenum's work.

Ye.K. Ligachev and G.P. Razumovskiy met with the first secretaries of Azerbaijan Communist Party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms.

Meetings and conversations were held with workers and engineering-technical personnel at the Baku Imeni 50-Letiya SSSR Refrigerator Plant. The topics discussed were the progress of restructuring, work under the new economic management conditions, the problems of raising the technical standards of production and improving the quality of consumer goods, and changes in the social sphere. The CPSU Central Committee secretaries enquired about the activity of the labor collective council and the state of the working people's international education. Opinions were exchanged on questions of the preparations for the 19th all-union party conference.

The CPSU Central Committee secretaries visited the R. Mustafayev Museum of Fine Arts, where they met with figures from the republic artists' union.

Ye.K. Ligachev and G.P. Razumovskiy were accompanied by A. Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

Vilnius Rally Honors Stalin Victims

LD2105200088 Moscow TASS in English 1559 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Vilnius May 21 TASS—The public of the capital of Lithuania (a Soviet Baltic republic) have today paid tribute to the memory of innocent victims of the violation of laws during the years of Stalin's personality cult. A meeting of city public has been called here on the initiative of the city Soviet of People's Deputies (municipality), creative unions, the cultural foundation and other public organizations of the republic. Thousands of people of various professions and convictions got together at the monument to Zigmas Angaretis-Alex, one of the founders of the Communist Party of Lithuania, who fell victim of Stalin's arbitrary rule 48 years ago. Among those who came for the rally were veterans of the revolutionary movement as well as persons notorious for their extremist actions.

It was way back at the 20th Congress of the CPSU that the misdeeds of the times of the personality cult were condemned, said Romas Sarmaitis, a 79-year old historian, corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of Lithuania, a former deputy of Angaretis. The words of truth about those tragic events were pronounced most forcefully at the 27th congress of Soviet Communists. "All the peoples of the Soviet Union, both big and small, suffered losses in those times," the scholar emphasized. "No small political and creative losses were suffered by the Lithuanian people, who restored Soviet power in their republic in 1940 and started building a new life."

In discussing in public now the crimes and the mistakes of the past, the Soviet people thus clear the road for a renovation of the society, create a favourable atmosphere for perestroyka, Romas Sarmaitis said in conclusion.

"Our society, which has started revolutionary reforms, is in a bad need of a truthful coverage along the lines of Marxist philosophy of the pages of the history of the past," said Jonas Gricius, chairman of the board of Lithuania's film-makers union, laureate of the USSR state prize.

In 1941 the large Gricius family were deported to the USSR's northern areas, but it was already during the years of the Second World World that due to the efforts by Soviet Lithuania's leadership that they could return from exile and join in the creative effort of Soviet people. [sentence as received] Augustinas Gricius, the father of the family, wrote pieces of prose, dramas and film scripts which were a contribution to the treasury of Lithuanian literature. His daughter Laima Griciute is doctor of medicine, an oncologist of world renown.

The speakers at the meeting condemned the crimes of the period of the personality cult and unanimously declared for clearing the Soviet society of the extraneous features of the past.

'Extremists' Demonstrate

LD2205193788 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] Vilnius May 22 TASS—Extremist elements, who do not like processes of democratisation and renovation of society which are under way in the USSR, today made

an attempt to stage an anti-social manifestation in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania. Under the guise of condemning the cult of Stalin's personality, they staged a gathering with anti-Soviet slogans at a central square of the city. The organizers managed to draw into the action about 300 people, who violated public order.

Those who gathered at the square left it at the demand of representatives of law and order bodies. Nobody was detained.

'Dozen' Reported Arrested

AU2305132288 Paris AFP in English 0023 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 23 (AFP)—Soviet police broke up a demonstration by between 1,000 and 3,000 people in the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius on Sunday, arresting around a dozen protestors, dissident Valeri Senderov said here. Mr Senderov cited witnesses who said the police arrested those who had spoken at a two-hour protest held to mark the 40th anniversary of the biggest of several waves of deportations of Lithuanians carried out under late Soviet dictator Josef Stalin.

However the official news agency TASS said that no arrests had been made at a demonstration by some 300 people, organized by "extremists on the pretext of condemning Stalin."

Mr Senderov said police had tried to drown out the speeches by bringing up a bus with loudspeakers mounted on top. He added that the security forces had not been particularly brutal when they moved in. Several people who had called for the protest were placed under house arrest on Sunday morning, Mr Senderov said. Telephone lines with dissidents in Lithuania were dead on Sunday evening.

The authorities in Vilnius hastily arranged an official commemorative ceremony on Saturday to pre-empt Sunday's unofficial protest.

From May 20 to 22, 1948, some 200,000 Lithuanians were deported from their Baltic state by Stalin.

Gorbachev Addresses Central Committee Plenum

LD2305124488 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The CPSU Central Committee held a regular plenum here today. It considered the draft theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th national party conference. Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke on the issue.

A debate followed. Closing remarks were made by Gorbachev.

The plenum endorsed the theses submitted by the Politburo and decided that they be published in the press for extensive discussion.

The plenum instructed Gorbachev to deliver a report at the 19th national party conference.

The plenum examined an organizational issue. It promoted Vladimir Karpov, first secretary of the Board of the Union of Writers of the USSR, from alternate to full membership of the CPSU Central Committee.

After that the plenum ended its work.

CPSU Adopts Resolution on Kurgan Obkom

LD1905154988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 19 May 88

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has adopted a resolution on organizational work by Kurgan Obkom organization for the social development of rural areas. The resolution notes that this work is being carried out, but there are serious shortcomings. The Kurgan rural areas occupy one of the last places in the Russian Federation for amenities. The development of the material and technical basis of culture and people's education lags behind. Rural area inhabitants are offered considerably less consumer services than area inhabitants. Serious omissions in the social development of the rural areas are conditioned by shortcomings in the style and methods of the work of the CPSU Obkom, its bureaus, town committees, and raykoms. The CPSU Central Committee has resolved to acknowledge as unsatisfactory the standard of organizational work of Kurgan Obkom and Oblispolkom for guiding the social development of rural areas, and to demand a radical change in the style and methods of this work.

Zaykov at Moscow Consumer Goods Meeting

LD1405030088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 13 May 88

[Text] Questions of the significant expansion of the production of consumer goods by Moscow industry and the improvement of their quality were examined by Comrade Zyakov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom; together with the heads of ministries, departments, soviet, party, and economic bodies of the city at an exhibition of consumer, cultural, and economic goods, manufactured by the capital city's enterprises—group A.

It was pointed out that the situation in this area is still unsatisfactory. The heads of the (Mipshe.met), Minenergotyazhprom, and other ministries were subjected to sharp criticism, as were enterprises in the capital that put out few consumer goods and manufacture outdated, unwanted, and poor-quality products. It is essential to make fuller use of all reserves and possibilities of the new methods of economic management in order to overcome

the lag. An important role here lies with the city and district soviets of people's deputies, which must take these issues under rigid control and coordinate the activity of enterprises situated within the capital.

The organization of trade must be seriously improved and it must become more demanding of the manufacturers of mass consumer goods and a constant analysis of consumer demand should be organized. Muscovites expect tangible results in this important work.

Zaykov, Murakhovskiy Visit Food Enterprises

PM2005102588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 May 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "The Green Conveyer"]

[Text] Questions of improving supplies of fruit and vegetable products for the inhabitants of the capital's region and the "Moskva" agro-industrial combine's work experience in the new conditions were examined 18 May by L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, together with senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee and leaders of the USSR and RSFSR Gosagroproms and of party, soviet, and economic bodies in the capital and the Moscow area.

At the "Moskovskiy" Sovkhoz there was an analysis of the experience of combining primary production, storage, processing, and marketing of agricultural products in a unified economic mechanism and plans for further increasing the production of fruit and vegetables on the basis of more efficient farming and widespread use of collective and lease contracts. This will make it possible to stop the bad practice of diverting citizens to fruit and vegetable depots and to give the countryside assistance on a business contract basis. There was a discussion of questions of setting up a direct field-to-store conveyer which will get products to the consumer more quickly and preserve their quality.

There was a lively conversation with customers in an agro-industrial complex store. The Muscovites spoke highly of the range of goods and quality of service and advocated a wider network of stores operating in accordance with the principles of collective or family contracts, economic accountability, and commercial viability.

It was stressed that the quickest way to implement the Food Program is to switch from the old command methods of leadership to a situation where labor collectives have a direct interest in the results of their activity. The new forms of management provide broad scope for organizing a highly efficient green conveyer.

Healthy competition for consumers between various suppliers and their direct-sales trade enterprises would help improve supplies of fruit and vegetables for the population and enhance trade standards. The solution of the food problem in the capital's region is part and parcel of the "Progress-95" program and other long-term plans and it should be implemented through the common efforts of city, oblast, and union and republican ministries and departments, with the involvement of other regions of the country. The key to the solution of this paramount social problem is the pooling of the efforts of party, soviet, and economic bodies, a persistent quest for new approaches, and the creation of an integral, smoothly operating food supply system. It is important to greet the 19th all-union party conference with concrete deeds, including real changes for the better in the provision of vegetables and fruit for the population.

V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom, I.I. Skiba, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agriculture and Food Industry Department, and V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Obkom, participated in the discussion.

Shcherbitskiy Tours Kirovograd 11 May

LD1305084788 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1515 GMT 11 May 88

[Text] Comrade Shcherbitskiy is on a visit to Kirovograd. Today he toured an [name indistinct] production association. While talking with workers, he enquired about their working and living conditions and about production matters. He also asked about the solution to the housing problem, the training and upbringing of young workers and about the struggle at the enterprise for a healthy way of life. His tour ended with a visit to the association's sports center.

In the afternoon, Vladimir Vasilyevich Shcherbitskiy strolled through the streets of Kirovograd and talked with its inhabitants. Comrade Shcherbitskiy was accompanied by Comrades Samilyk, first secretary of the Kirovograd party obkom; and Zheliba, chairman of the oblast executive committee.

Vorotnikov Returns to Moscow From Buryatiya

LD2205005588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2130 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Comrade Vorotnikov left Ulan Ude for Moscow on Saturday. He was in Buryatiya from 18 to 21 May. He familiarized himself with the progress of restructuring in the republic beyond the Baykal. Comrade Vorotnikov visited the Order of the Labor Red Banner aircraft plant and the Ulan Ude fine cloth combine named after the Lenin Komsomol. On 19 May a meeting with the party and economic aktiv of the autonomous republic took place in the Buryat Oblast CPSU Committee. During his stay in Eastern Siberia, Comrade Vorotnikov also visited southern Yakutiya, where he familiarized himself with the construction of the Amur-Yakutsk main railway line, linking Berkakit-Tommot-Yakutsk and the production facility of the Neryungrinskiy open cast coal mine and

met the party and economic aktiv of Neryungri. On 21 May Comrade Vorotnikov visited the town of Ust-Kut in the Irkutsk Oblast and looked at the work of the Lena-Osetrovo transport junction.

Baklanov Visits Voskresensk Fertilizer Plant
PM2005104388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 May 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Visiting Voskresensk Chemical Workers"]

[Text] The "Minudobreniya" production association in Voskresensk is one of the country's leading enterprises specializing in the production of sulfuric acid and compound phosphorus fertilizers. It regularly fulfills state plans and socialist pledges and is paying a great deal of attention to the solution of social and consumer questions and environmental conservation. On 18 May CPSU Central Committee Secretary O.D. Baklanov visited the Moscow Oblast enterprise.

During the meeting with workers and specialists there was an examination of a range of questions on whose solution the growth of output essential to the national economy depends. In view of the high degree of fixed capital wear and tear special attention was paid to increasing the pace of reconstruction and retooling of production facilities.

Machine builders have to increase their contribution to solving this very important task. They should provide the chemical workers with all the equipment and production automation facilities they need, while seeking to improve their technical standard and quality.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary asked about the collective's work in conditions of restructuring and expansion of glasnost and democratization, the progress being made in the introduction of economic accountability, and working people's labor, living, and leisure conditions and visited the dispensary and the sport and leisure complex.

How economic accountability affects every worker, how to improve the organization of the task of switching the association's shops to contract work, and how to improve food supplies for people—these topics were discussed during the detailed and frank talks with production workers. They expressed full support for the restructuring course and have substantial labor achievements with which to greet the 19th all-union party conference.

In the final conversation with the association leaders and specialists emphasis was placed on the special importance of the introduction of wastefree technology, of saving all types of resources, increasing consumer goods production, and developing the economic method of construction.

O.D. Baklanov was accompanied by V.K. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.G. Afonin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Chemical Industry Department, and N.M. Olshanskiy, USSR minister for mineral fertilizer production.

Batalin Addresses Monuments Conservation Forum
PM2005140288 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 May 88 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Long Life for Monuments"]

[Excerpts] It is the civic duty of every Soviet person to be responsible not only for the fatherland's present and future, but also for the preservation of its past, for the priceless creations of earlier generations. This was discussed at the All-Union Conference on the Conservation, Restoration, and Use of Monuments of History, Culture, and Architecture that ended in Moscow 17 May. Its participants discussed problems of conserving the historical and cultural heritage and outlined specific ways of improving the noble cause of protecting the masterpieces of the past.

The results of discussions held in three sections, at which more than 70 people spoke, were summed up. [passage omitted]

It was deemed expedient to form interdepartmental commissions to draft economic measures connected with questions of conserving the national heritage, including the valuation of land in historic city centers, as well as construction, repair, and planning work.

There were many disputes in discussing problems of propagandizing the historical and cultural heritage—it is considered urgent to cover these questions widely in the mass media, taking account of the many opposing opinions. [passage omitted]

Speakers in all sections particularly noted the need to create a union central organ for the conservation and restoration of monuments under the USSR Council of Ministers and to improve the Law on the Conservation and Use of Historical and Cultural Monuments. It was acknowledged to be important to form an all-union scientific research and design institute of conservation of monuments and the historical environment. [passage omitted]

The conference was addressed by Yu.P. Batalin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosstroy.

The concluding address was delivered by V.G. Zakharov, USSR minister of culture.

Recommendations were drawn up for improving the work of conservation, restoration, and use of monuments of history, culture, and architecture.

Supreme Soviet Deputies Begin Registering

LD2205223288 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 22 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Registration of deputies arriving for the regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet that opens in Moscow 24 May started today in the Great Kremlin Palace.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent A. Krutov, identified by caption] This session is to adopt a law which, one can say, will make us look quite anew at the development of our economy; this is the law on cooperatives. The draft has undergone nationwide discussion, the working commission of the Supreme Soviet has received more than 200,000 amendments and suggestions for the law, and the standing commissions which are examining the matter have formulated their proposals in this brochure, and are submitting them to the session. And of course, the deputies will also have their own suggestions when it is discussed. Are you happy with everything in this draft?

[N.I. Pisar, agronomist (Moldavian SSR), identified by caption] I am not happy with everything. For example, article 31. It is written in clause one that kolkhozes are given the right to plan independently their growing of agricultural produce. But further on there is another clause, saying kolkhozes should sell produce according to contracts, but proceeding from state orders—that is, they are compelled, that is, according to directions, and so we will never independently reach the level of development to be able to offer competition to these cooperatives that have emerged.

[Krutov] So you will oppose these two clauses in the draft law on cooperatives.

[Pisar] Yes, I will, and I have some proposals of my own. [passage omitted]

[Krutov] Yes, the deputies bear a great responsibility—what will the law look like? May it not end up like the Law on the State Enterprise. Less than a year ago, that too underwent nationwide discussion, it was adopted unanimously, but now? Now serious corrections are being demanded. It is not working the way it was imagined. The electors also expect from the deputies a specific analysis of the way that the program for construction of housing and social-cultural amenities mapped out by the 27th party congress is being carried out. [end recording]

Supreme Soviet To Debate Housing Problem

LD2305100488 Moscow TASS in English 0929 GMT 23 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—TASS news analyst Igor Yefimov writes:

A session of the USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament) opens in the Kremlin tomorrow. The session has riveted special attention: The parliamentarians are to discuss a draft law on cooperatives which introduces fundamental changes to the Soviet economic machinery. The second item on the agenda also involves the interests of millions of families—the session will review the course of the implementation of the program for the construction of housing, cultural centres and service establishments in this country.

A parliamentary debate on the draft law on cooperatives will sum up almost a three-month discussion of the document by the public at large. The draft law, with a volume of about 80 pages, which determines economic, organisational and legal conditions for the activities of the cooperatives, was published by all leading Soviet newspapers early in March. This was followed by an animated discussion in the press and at meetings.

The principal importance of the draft law is that it seals equality of the state sector and of the cooperative one. The latter, although it existed before, was regarded as something secondary and at times undesirable. From now on the state of affairs in this respect should cardinally change. The scope of changes can be judged if only by the fact that the draft law allows cooperatives to engage in foreign economic activity which has been so far the monopoly of the state.

A few words about the second item on the session's agenda. The 27th Congress of the CPSU (1986) set an important social task: To provide every Soviet family with an individual well-appointed apartment or a house by the year 2000. Estimates show that to achieve this it is essential to build approximately 36 million apartments.

The parliamentarians are to analyse what has been done, to understand what hinders the implementation of the housing program in individual regions and to decide on how to ensure its realisation within the designated period without fail.

The session will also hear a report by the Supreme Court of the USSR, and will consider the decrees adopted by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet over the period that has passed since the previous session.

Oblast Party Committees Elect New Leaders

LD2105201488 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 7may 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today the Gorno-Altay Autonomous Oblast party committee held a plenum which examined an organizational matter.

The plenum released Comrade Znamenskiy from his duties as first secretary of the oblast party committee in connection with his retirement on pension.

Comrade (Natov) formerly first secretary of Talmenskiy Rayon Party Committee in Altay Kray, has been elected first secretary of the Gorno-Altay Oblast CPSU Committee.

An organizational matter was also examined at the Karachayevo-Cherkess Oblast CPSU committee plenum. The plenum released Comrade Inzhiyevskiy from his duties as first secretary of the oblast committee in connection with his transfer to other work.

Comrade (Lisnichenko) previously secretary of the Stavropol Kray CPSU Committee, has been elected first secretary of the Karachayevo-Cherkess Oblast party committee.

Local Parties Elect Conference Delegates

Kirghizia Elections

LD2105144788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Delegates to the 19th all-union party conference have been elected at a plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kirghizia. The plenum discussed the tasks of the republican party organization in implementing the reform of secondary and higher education, and providing ideological support for restructuring. It was noted that, in the republic, there have been positive changes in the development of the educational sphere. However, the reform has not yet been given its proper scale or depth of transformation. There are still Communists who have not drawn practical conclusions from the party's requirements concerning personal active participation in ideological and political work. All this has an effect on improving the content, form and methods of the teaching process. Measures for eliminating these shortcomings were outlined.

The plenum was addressed by Comrade Masaliyev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kirghizia.

Turkmenistan, Tajikstan

LD2105145188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 21 May 88

[Text] Delegates to the 19th all-union party conference were elected today at the plenums of the central committees of the Communist parties of Turkmenistan and Tajikistan, which took place in Ashkhabad and Dushanbe.

The plenum in Ashkhabad also discussed the tasks of the republican party organization regarding implementing the reform of higher and secondary education and the ideological provisions of restructuring in the light of the decision of the 1988 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. The plenum was addressed by Comrade Nyazov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan. The plenum mapped out the measures for improving party leadership over the restructuring of people's education and over the renewal of the forms and methods of ideological, political, and educational work.

Democratic principles in the selection and placement of cadres, and the development of glasnost—these were the questions at the center of attention at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Tajikistan, which took place in Dushanbe. Actively influencing the process of restructuring is the most important task of the party primary organizations, stressed the plenum. Comrade Makhkanov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Tajikistan, delivered a speech.

Semipalitinsk Oblast

LD2305083788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 22 May 88

[Text] The nomination of delegates to the 19th all-union party conference is continuing in our country. The elections in the Semipalatinsk Oblast party organization of Kazakhstan took the form of a frank and interested conversation about the future paths of restructuring. The very holding of a plenum of the oblast party committee has become a clear lesson in democracy. Its participants had a chance to express their views freely on every nomination.

Murmansk Elects 100

LD2305083588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 22 May 88

[Excerpt] More than 100 candidates [as delegates to the June CPSU Conference] were nominated by the primary party organizations in Murmansk Oblast; 26 of them were elected at the plenum of the oblast party committee. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Talk With Church Leaders Lauded

PM2305082788 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 19, 8 May 88 p 4

[Aleksandr Nezhnyy "Our Commentary" article: "Common History, One Homeland"]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev met with Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia and members of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church for an hour and half on April 29. Ninety minutes may not seem like much time. But the significance of this meeting cannot be measured by the time allotted it. Even some of the good ideas it generated—of founding a church to commemorate the Millenium of the Baptism of Rus or of using televison to highlight the coming jubilee (specifically, the Intervision and Eurovision channels to broadcast the solemn event

and the concert of holy music at the Bolshoi Theatre June 10)—even they pale when compared with the significance for our society of that dialgue in the Kremlin.

On a September night in 1943, Stalin received three metropolitans of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Kremlin. What followed that meeting—the reopening of theological schools and dozens of Orthodox churches, the publication of the JOURNAL OF THE MOSCOW PARTIARCHATE—amounted to Stalin's tacit recognition after some 15 years of the political untenability of his ruthless suppression of the church.

In subsequent years Stalin remained paradoxically faithful to his committments in relation to the church. Although instead of relying on legislation, the church depended for its existence on Stalin's (the "wisest of all leaders") word, good will and possibly his memories of the seminary period. The principle of freedom of conscience proclaimed by the consititution and the norm of the law could not serve for the church and believers as a reliable support in a society which had not formalized democratic guarantees against the arbitrary practices of the authorities. The administrative offensive against the church at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s demonstrated a new the reluctance of the bureaucratic apparatus to reckon with the interests of the considerable part of the country's population.

That is why, perhaps, the most promising result of the April 29 meeting is the desire, as Mikhail Gorbachev put it, to reestablish Leninist principles in relation to religion, the church and believers. The reconstruction of our society presupposes democracy in relation to the church and respect for the feelings of believers. Freedom of the conscience is not an abstract notion; it amounts to an indispensable condition of life for millions of believers, and without that unconditional right protected by law, there can be no question of society having more socialism. Democracy, the freedom of expression and productive dialogue—these are, in Mikhail Gorbachev's opinion, the foundations of the Soviet state's relations with the church and believers. The meeting in the Kremlin reaffirmed the principle of the pluralism of opinions which is indispensable for the promotion of democracy.

The church exists in our society not because this is permitted by one or another leader, but because it and the millions of belivers are a historical reality which has to be reckoned with. But there are still many people who would make the existence of religious organizations dependent on their will, who are used not reckoning with the law, and who are still under the illusion that religion can be eradicated. They see the difference in ideologies as an irksome misunderstanding which can be dealt with administratively. Unfortunately, I cannot name one government official who would be punished for an unwarranted refusal to register a religious society. It is, however, difficult to mould society's genuinely democratic attitude towards the church and believers without first destroying the notion of the church as some hostile force, and of believers as second-class citizens.

I know that there will be those who see the meeting as a step backward and as a concession to the church. That is why it is particularly important to accentuate the thought, voiced by Mikhail Gorbachev, that the depth of ideological differences is not an obstacle to cooperation, that these believers are Soviet people, workers and patriots who have the full right to express their convictions.

Believers expect much of perestroyka. Most of them already support it even more actively if the principle of the freedom of conscience is realized and if the legislation on religious worship equals the democratic transformations of our society.

Obkom Leader Describes Restructuring Work

PM1805123188 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 9 May 88 p 3

[Article by Yuriy Manayenkov under the rubric "The 19th All-Union Conference: A Party Worker's Notes": "Establishing the Irreversibility of Restructuring"; first paragraph is editorial introduction—boldface as published]

[Text] Yuriy Alekseyevich Manayenkov is first secretary of Lipetsk party obkom, a CPSU Central Committee member, and a USSR Supreme Soviet deputy. He is 51 years old and has spent 25 years in ideological and party work. Trained as an agronomist, he worked for several years on a kolkhoz and then for a rayon newspaper. He has been a party raykom secretary, a department chief, and secretary of the Tambov party obkom. He became head of the Lipetsk oblast party organization in January 1984. In today's "Party Worker's Notes," the author offers his views on the run-up to the 19th all-union party conference.

Restructuring is not a well-worn path, where once you pass the danger point you are immediately ensured against shocks. Thus, the draft State Law on the Cooperative System, like the Law on the State Enterprise (Association), which entails a decentralization of economic management, confused some of our cadres. Some people are still confused, even by a requirement as natural as one that all communists, regardless of rank or merit, be seen as equal in terms of the Party Statute. Nina Andreyeva's article, "I Cannot Waive Principles," which was carried by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, reflects that confusion. Indeed, it is a trial balloon: Do not commit yourself too much to restructuring, do not go overboard, do not make a mistake. And if the party fails to spot the "balloon," the changes that have started can gradually be reversed.

Many workers, including leading ones, have shown their political culture by their attitude to that piece, rather like a touchstone. A certain section of them, although paying lip service to the inevitability of revolutionary restructuring, would prefer to implement it in more "peaceful" forms and at a more "moderate" pace.

The truth, as we know, is born of debate and the clash of opinions. But that article cannot be called a contribution to the discussion of the ways, content, and forms of restructuring or to its short- and long-term goals. It is simply harmful. Anyone who demands that tribute be paid to Stalin and his merits should not forget that he cannot be forgiven as a politician and that, with the methods he used and the losses he inflicted on the country, even victories can frequently become grave defeats. However, there are those who are ready to idealize, in addition to Stalin, anyone who was involved with party and state policy and the fate of their fellow-countrymen at that time. They had "authority," they "knew how to lead," their "word carried weight".... But is that true? Perhaps it was fear rather than authority? After all, punishment, criticism, and persecution became the major and most "authoritative" instrument of education.

The truth is undeniable. It is probably time for us to publish those documents in which some now "authoritative" party leaders responded to the plan for the destruction of the "enemies of the people," which the center "imposed" on the oblasts, by sending a telegram to Moscow requesting an increase in the "first section" of the plan or, to put it more bluntly, in the number of people to be shot.

N. Andreyeva is not alone in her views of socialism and restructuring, but she herself is not the issue, of course. It is those group interests and moods that she expresses. It is also the fact that the pictures of the generalissimo, which we used to see on the roofs of vehicles, made a lasting impression on some people's minds, and are now obscuring the changes as well as the past. I see this as the reason why a section of the creative intelligentsia, and not only it, unduly dramatize the problem of the continuity of traditions.

Some comrades have spent a great deal of time trying to prove that young people today are virtually a lost generation. They claim that young people wear the wrong clothes, sing the wrong songs, and have the wrong cultural idols. Due to our fear of any change, which was instilled over the years, we sound the alarm at the onset of mass culture. We do so despite our occasional lack of a clear picture of the origins and components of that phenomenon. We also forget that every generation has its own "songs," and its own innovation. In addition, we ignore the fact that the renewal introduced into spiritual life by young people sweeps away accumulated debris with the inevitability of a fresh breeze, and intimidates backward thinkers. In the process, we obscure the main point, which is the way Soviet youth work, how they enrich our image of the world, and how they study and live. Yes, some young people are more obsessed than we, their fathers, with the lure of vice. But that is our fault, too, as it is a reflection of the problems of a society in which we allowed Stalinist despotism, "starry-eyed" conformity, bare-faced corruption, and methods typical of Medunov, Churbanov, and ultimately Brezhnev to flourish unchecked. In fact, after V.I. Lenin, we did not have a scientifically validated organization for educating people or a system for the spiritual promotion of the individual.

I grew up in a sleepy village where even now the peasants have no need to lock their homes. Yet, from the very first days of collectivization, it was considered customary at the kolkhoz to "take."

The postwar years, when people began talking about Stalin's insincerity, as well as the sixties, when facetious remarks about Khrushchev oozed from the people like volcanic magma, are clear in the mind. And we all remember the seventies—the false modesty of the people on television, where speaker after speaker, weighed down by old age and regalia, struggled to mount the rostrum. Those are the major lessons. They "shot" (the first and most painful!) holes in people's hearts and minds and we are only just beginning to bind them, to heal them, and to develop a harmonious and honest system of education. However, I am convinced that our young people today are reliable, too. They embark on life with a broad reserve of knowledge, they strive to know the truth, they are ready to promote worthy spiritual leaders from their midst, to take the cause of restructuring into their own hands, and to triumph. That is why we are working boldly to reduce the average age of our cadres.

People scarcely more than 30 years old are now joining the leadership of party committees and the apparatus in the oblast. True, you do sometimes hear it said: Aren't we in too much of a hurry, are we not overestimating their potential? That is a symptom of stagnation. That is what happens when a worker has secured his position in the oblast party "system" solely for the sake of a pension. Today's young people have already found time to be "ordinary" workers, chief specialists, and leaders of enterprises and organizations. They have acquired a taste for public work, and have gained experience in life.

Take the example of Aleksandr Nikolayevich Nikonov. In his 32 years he has acquired sound experience in labor collectives as the chief engineer and party committee secretary of two very large farms. As chairman, he restored an "ailing" kolkhoz to good health, was head of the Dobrinskiy Rayon agro-industrial association, and is now deputy chief of the party obkom's department of agriculture and food industry. I would not be surprised if in the future they entrusted him with the leadership of the rayon. Party raykom first secretaries O. Korolev, P. Moskvoretskiy, V. Gerasimov, and N. Tagintsev are cast in the mold of such brilliant young cadres, inspired by

the ideas of restructuring.... They are not burdened with outdated, stereotypical forms of behavior. Their thinking is bold and innovative, and they have the ability to change and enhance not only the economic and social life of their rayons but their spiritual life, too.

Where does their confidence come from? These people are replacing those who could not restructure themselves, and the very process of replacement has its own psychological momentum and orientation. The trend is toward resolute changes prompted by life itself. This process cannot be put into a schedule or integrated scheme.

I, for example, do not support the view currently appearing in our newspapers to the effect that the seeds of bureaucracy are often planted in party work by yesterday's Komsomol functionaries and activists. That is impossible if they were tempered among the working masses and have given a good account of themselves in practical soviet, economic, or grass roots party activity. Naturally, though, there has been a bureaucratization of the Komsomol apparatus. This fact was also noted at the 20th Komsomol Congress a year ago. In general, it is time to cast off the shackles of the restrictions imposed for the most part by the application form. At grass roots level, the party needs people of different ages and from different "backgrounds." We need people from the "arts," "technicians," "physical scientists," "poets," "agriculturalists," teachers, doctors, architects, construction workers, machine builders, and scientists.... However, they must all have a high level of education and competence, a political and general culture, intelligence, honesty, and that Leninist charisma, which is so attractively shown in the ability to motivate people and take them along. That is the basis we use when training leaders. As the party never ceases to remind us, this is inconceivable without the broadest democratization of every aspect of life.

As in many other regions, so in our oblast, too, glasnost is developing on a broader scale in the work of party, soviet, and economic organs. The renewal of leading cadres at all levels is proceeding without the imposition of "approved" candidates by the head office. We hold consultations in the primary party organization and the labor collective and receive a character reference of the candidate for promotion. This is done openly and publicly, and there is a clash of different attitudes. At this point, we consult with the raykom bureau, the plenum, and the obkom bureau. A democratic mechanism is being formed, which will preclude arbitrary rule and even mistakes. It will not only select a true leader, but will ensure that even before assuming a leadership post, he absorbs that democratic spirit with his heart and mind.

In the first 2 and 1/2 years of restructuring, 860 leaders on the obkom party list have been replaced, and some 40 percent of its apparatus has been renewed. We are ridding ourselves of the smug, pretentious, uncultured, and spineless workers who shun real labor with the people. On this subject, I would like to recall a gloomy article in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA about party gorkom and raykom secretaries who have no time for reading. Fortunately, we do not hold on to such workers. A good 50 percent of the oblast's party gorkom and raykom first secretaries have an educational background in the arts. However, under today's conditions, ideological and educational work with people must not be assigned solely to those educated in the "arts." It is my deeply held conviction that ideological work must be conducted by the entire party committee, including representatives from the most diverse disciplines, and it must be headed by the first secretary.

When we reject stereotypes in ideological activity we consistently translate it into a system of direct and open dialogue with the people and frank and incisive discussion. Such a dialogue is difficult when you are on the platform, and most often we get by without it. Let us be blunt, direct, and frank: Dialogue with the people is not easy. Our colleagues in Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia saw this for themselves once again when they learned this distressing lesson and taught it to many of us as well. Today you do not ask people to wait while you prepare an answer to the question that is bothering them. You have to reply immediately. In talking with the people, you must show personal feeling. This will appeal to and convince everyone, and draw them into thinking about the problems raised by life. At the moment, unfortunately, emotional content prevails in the works of historians. However, in my view, logic and scientific evidence are more appropriate there.

The party has a vital need for passionate, lively, and intelligent work by political workers, propagandists, and agitators. Restructuring constantly gives rise to the most pressing situations. Let us take the party's paramount concerns today—the naming of delegates to the 19th all-union party conference, and ways to guarantee that party organizations are represented by true exponents of restructuring, and not by people chosen at random, regardless of their proficiency. It is clear that party workers, agitators, and propagandists must resolve this problem democratically, persuade people, and motivate them. They must prove to them that the fate of the upcoming party forum depends largely on their activity, political will, and sense of responsibility when examining candidates.

Meanwhile, the corps of agitators and lecturers has become smaller. Some of them, realizing that they were not prepared for direct and frank dialogue with the people, requested another party assignment. They should not be condemned for that. However, what is truly alarming is that you increasingly hear the retort: Are we not spending too much time discussing the content and goals of the transformations that we have begun? Is it not time to switch from talk to action?

Yes, we have yet to acquire a sense of professionalism. However, in the new stage of social development, when the active formulation of a theory of socialism is becoming an urgent and vital need, when the people's social conduct and the rules of socialist communal life are becoming more humane, and when fundamental changes are taking place in the economy and other spheres of social life, we all have things to discuss, bearing in mind that words are deeds, too. This is not a question of idle talk or speculative theorizing. It is a profound theoretical elaboration of topical problems of socialist construction. Here, too, we are still not saying enough. We have not understood the dialectics of the changes—either in practice or theory. Despite the fact that a good many articles appear in the newspapers under the "Questions of Theory" rubric, it is my deeply held conviction that the demand for a profound theoretical study of the problems raised by life has yet to be well satisfied. Many publications are marked by a lack of originality and a timidity of theoretical thought. They are dominated by commentaries on ideas and thoughts already expressed at Central Committee plenums. Yet people engaged in restructuring expect our social scientists to present the new and unusually complex problems of the qualitative renewal of socialism in a bold and enterprising way.

Imagine, for instance, the tremendous moral potential that could be harnessed by scientifically validating and creating a mechanism to prevent a recurrence of bureaucracy and corruption and developing a system to revive party comradeship, mutual trust, and consciousness in policy. Then, unlike now, there would be no need to listen attentively whenever your contemporaries express admiration for a particular figure while slyly calculating whether his services to history and the motherland's future are genuine or whether those services are no higher than the grave of the one he labeled the "enemy of the people" and who is, in fact, the people itself. Then, such contradictory figures as Khrushchev, whose initiatives were undermined by inertia, would be seen in a different political light. How can it be defeated? First of all, we must not give ourselves airs or graces. And we must no longer be intimidated by the danger that criticism poses to the fate of the common cause. Criticism is the symbol of our strength, and it must be the norm of social life. In addition, it can only be established as such in the course of the further democratization of the party and society. At that point, we may hope that the problem of providing social protection to those who criticize what have been called the powers that be will become noticeably less acute. But for the time being, party committees and organizations must respond promptly and in a principled way to the diverse and, at times, highly sophisticated forms of suppressing criticism.

The day that we cease to critically evaluate the results of our own activity is the day that restructuring starts to decline. For that reason, we must comprehensively support and reinforce the critical attitude of the mass media of information and propaganda. After all, they are a particularly powerful voice of criticism. In doing so, we must not give vent to ambition or arrogance. When giving high marks to the contribution of the press to restructuring, we must continue to comprehensively encourage the principles of analysis in its activity.

I believe that a serious shortcoming of many papers, including the central ones, is the fact that journalists cannot and sometimes do not know how to "grasp" phenomena in their dialectical development, or to consider a given fact in depth or perceive its roots. The problem here is a lack of competence, and an absence of basic knowledge of one's subject while in pursuit of an allegedly "hot" story.

The tangible increase in the circulation of local newspapers is a sign of the active role our press plays in restructuring. Our oblast newspaper is no exception. Today people line up for it outside the "Soyuzpechat" kiosks. Not everyone manages to buy a copy of our LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA. People read it from cover to cover, and it is cited in letters and speeches. Our newspaper is "sharp-tongued," as they say, and is becoming professional. That is not just my opinion.

It goes without saying that I am opposed to lowering the level of criticism in the press and to rationing it in any way. However, I am convinced that it should be more constructive and should look not only to our distant and more recent past, from which, of course, all the necessary lessons for the future should be drawn. Indeed, such lessons must also be drawn from our present and from the living and, I repeat, contradictory experience of restructuring. Here, too, there are unassimilated areas, especially if you recall the useful experience, and the innovation that comes with the practice of revolutionary transformation. From a professional point of view, it is more difficult to write about this. I know that from my own experience; I used to be a journalist. But this must be done. That is the only way in which the ideas of society's revolutionary renewal can be comprehensively enhanced in people's eyes.

The ideology of this renewal categorically demands that every party committee take the lead in the struggle to cleanse our life of moral and social corrosion, personal immodesty, bragging, arrogant smugness, elementary parasitism, and group egoism. All of these elements flourish in the distorted concept of democracy that some of our people have. There are still quite a few people who forget that democracy presupposes the strictest order and organization and the highest labor discipline. Frequently, a man starts a new job, and asks not how much he can earn but how much he will receive. If a negligent worker is deprived of his bonus he is convinced that he has been treated undemocratically, and has no qualms about saying so aloud. At this point, I cannot help recalling A. Gelman's brilliantly profound and axiomatic idea in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA on the need to distinguish between "freedom for the head and freedom for the feet."

We have a poultry farm known as "Berezovskaya," which raises ducks. From time to time, the farm fails to fulfill its production plan and its feed consumption is above the norm. However, when the occasion permits, its director has no qualms about taking advantage of his official position. For years now, he has been using the official car to travel back and forth from the oblast center to the countryside for business. By hook or crook, and with the help of the republic's "poultry industry administration," farm officials have managed to obtain figures, which they are now citing in their loud claims that the collective is being "pressured" and undersupplied with feed. What is this if not an example of that ingrained egoism, which is not averse to juggling facts, distorting accounts, and resorting to "showy" effects? I will be blunt: This tendency to hold rallies and the desire of some people to take to the streets to demonstrate their commitment to restructuring reminds me of the sham prosperity of days gone by.

In the past, we party workers were interested first and foremost in ideological support for the production plan. Now, though, it is becoming increasingly clear that the molding of the new man is an independent asset for the party, and that the comprehensive development of the individual is a goal of socialism inherent in the new social system. The realization of this factor radically alters the very approach to all ideological activity. This applies not only to the evaluation of those who prepare production programs, as they increasingly need guidance on the diverse interests not only of all society and of the labor collective, but of each individual worker. Ideological work is being more closely coordinated with economic practice. These new approaches can be seen in every sector of the economy. However, they are most clearly visible in the agro-industrial complex, where the lease contract, including the family contract, are becoming more firmly established with the passing day, and where small group forms of labor organization and production are being introduced. To a certain extent, we are right to speak today of the rebirth of Lenin's New Economic Policy on a more mature basis.

Under the new conditions, party committees and economic management bodies in the oblast see it as one of their most important tasks to make the labor process itself increasingly attractive to people, improve labor conditions as much as possible, and make the worker's daily life more humane. I well remember the time when we were accountable first and foremost for the plan. That is what the plan says; no questions allowed! As for a man's life under this system, his physical and moral health, that was rarely much of a concern to anyone. However, the result of this narrow pragmatic approach to work was that production plans ultimately ceased to be fulfilled.

People expect us to give direct answers to the questions that worry them. You cannot hide behind quotations or offer only a stony silence. It is dangerous to do so, as you must make good the gaps in life to ensure there are none in people's hearts. The mood of the collective at our Novolipetsk metallurgical combine is consistently good, as a great deal is being done there to improve working, living, and cultural conditions, and to strengthen public health. Recently I went to the "Petrovskiy" sovkhoz—there were all kinds of shortages and the workers' mood was quite different. They were also "for" restructuring, but they criticized it and had doubts about it. They said: No sooner had the sovkhoz director gone off on leave than his deputy quickly "arranged" a three-room apartment for a relative. It is true: What sort of restructuring is this if its fate depends on a good leader, but, unfortunately, you don't have people like that everywhere! The spiritual sphere and our morality, like the economic mechanism, must be transformed into a self-adjusting and self-regulating system, which would automatically ensure protection against chance events and arbitrary behavior.

Many of our problems with education and the ideology of renewal stem from the fact that we, the party committees, have lost our influence as organs of political leadership. We have "hoarded" all those jobs that should be done by soviets, economic managers, scientists, specialists, and even...supply workers. That is why we are failing to keep pace with life in some respects. Under these conditions, the slogan "All power to the Soviets!" acquires a new historic meaning: Party organizations must restore some functions to their rightful place. They must **direct** processes and **not manage** them. Much here will be decided by the attitudes the party cadres themselves take to the problem. We do not exclude the possibility that it will take a special party Central Committee resolution to protect soviets from interference by over-zealous party administrators. And the soviets themselves must become more democratic. They should manage the life of their territories, and the apparatus should be the working organization. It would make sense to create presidiums within soviets, from the rayon level up, to work with deputies and standing commissions. It would also be wise to demand in particular that they ensure that the accountability of ispolkoms to soviets be not merely formal, as it is now, but vital and real, just as deputies are accountable to the voters. Perhaps the tax system should also be changed in favor of local soviets. Today they receive pennies from union- and republic-level enterprises and provide cultural workers, teachers, and physicians with poor-quality housing...

I know from my meetings with people that many link the idea of holding the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference with the democratization of party life and the suppression of bureaucratic structures and principles. I believe we must abolish the sector departments of party committees, which often duplicate existing economic structures, and strengthen the economic department. We must have powerful functional departments—departments for party organizational work and for agitation and propaganda. In addition, we must reinforce the party commission so as to enhance control and step up the fight for the purity and honesty of party members.

We must likewise work for a correspondence between word and action. But people say: Are we not returning to the institution of Central Committee party organizers or other similar central "envoys" at the local level? I am confident that in the conditions of democratization this notion is simply far-fetched and empty.

What are we doing, comrades? Are we resorting to the "big stick" again, do we need an overseer once more? Is it a revival of the fear of the accusing finger? In that case, how can we talk about the expansion of party democracy? I am sure that when we achieve the real independence of labor collectives, the party worker will no longer be a spy or a bureaucrat but a real worker, an educator of the masses, and a friend and comrade.

...It is important to avoid haste or, as the people say, we must "make haste slowly" so as to prevent the development of restructuring from becoming just another loud campaign. Our major task is to see the revolutionary transformations that we have begun through to their logical conclusion. And we will do it. We will be followed by young people brought up not during the periods of the "cult" or "stagnation," but at a time of renewal and a return to democracy and Leninist principles of party leadership.

Moscow City Prosecutor Interviewed

PM2005112588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 May 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Moscow City Prosecutor L. Baranov by observer Yu. Feofanov under the rubric "Legal Dialogues": "Citizen's Rights and Prosecutor's Duties"; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction—boldface as published]

[Text] Lenin demanded of jurists that they teach working people to fight for their rights. Unfortunately, to this day we have still not fully learned to do this. There is, however, another aspect of the problem: We know how to fight, we do fight, but we cannot exercise our legitimate rights. Why? This was the key question during a conversation between IZVESTIYA observer Yu. Feofanov and Moscow City Prosecutor L. Baranov.

[Feofanov] The press often publicizes instances of innocent people being sentenced, illegal methods being used to obtain the required evidence in the course of preliminary investigations, and so on. But everything begins with the detention. It takes place without a prosecutor's warrant. But does this mean that it is not subject to prosecutor's supervision? In this context, Lev Petrovich, I would like to find out how this supervision is effected. What are the consequences of unjustified detention for a militia staffer? And under what circumstances in general may someone be detained? It seems to me that someone detained by the militia is altogether without rights. In this sense, he is in a worse position than an accused person who is on trial. Does he, for example, have the right—and I emphasize, the right—to telephone his family or his work and tell them what has happened to him?

[Baranov] I would formulate your question—"Under what circumstances may someone be detained?"—differently: "In which circumstances is detention legal?" Detention is effected on the basis of Articles 122 and 122-1 of the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure which plainly defines it as "...an act of coercion for the purpose of ensuring efficiency in the struggle against crime." It is natural that the detainee's rights will be infringed and his freedom curtailed. Is this justified? Judge for yourself: Detention is an urgent investigative action applied following the detection of a crime. Does this mean that the detainee has no rights at all? Not at all. The inquiry and investigation organs are entitled to detain an individual only if criminal proceedings are instituted, as we say, on the basis of prima facie evidence [po faktu prestupleniya] of crime. Also in cases when an individual has been caught flagrante delicto or when eyewitnesses, including victims, specifically identify this individual; when clear traces of the crime are detected on the person or clothing of the suspect; if the individual has attempted to escape or if the suspect's identity has not been established. Unless these conditions are satisfied, the detention is illegal. The prosecutor is responsible for the legality of these actions. He must protect the detainee's rights, including in particular his right to be told of what he is suspected, to offer his explanation, and to address a complaint to any state organ. As regards the telephone. No, the law has so far made no provision for the exercise of such a right.

[Feofanov] Do the words "so far" indicate that you personally believe it necessary to make provisions for the exercise of such a right?

[Baranov] The question is not as simple as it might appear. It is incumbent upon the arresting officer [operrabotnik] to notify the family of a citizen's detention. But if the detainee is suspected of a serious crime (murder, rape, theft, and so on), a specific decision must be made as to when exactly to notify "the outside world" about it. You must bear in mind that a telephone call about a detention could be the signal to conceal the traces of a crime. Especially if it is a personal telephone call. Nevertheless, I would make provisions for a detainee's right to make a personal telephone call subject to the few exceptions I mentioned.

[Feofanov] Everyone knows that if custody is chosen as the measure to secure appearance in court, a prison sentence is likely to ensue. True enough, there have been some acquittals recently. But this is something else. Let us assume that the court has established the criminal acts committed by the person before it, but the measure of punishment may not necessarily involve deprivation of liberty. This is what happens: If the man in the dock is under guard he will certainly end up doing time; if he is

not under guard the court may pass a sentence not involving imprisonment. But such predetermination is in itself immoral and illegal. Does the prosecutor take this into account when deciding on the measure to secure appearance in court? You must agree: An arrest should be made only when there is no alternative, not whenever it can be made.

[Baranov] You are right. "Predetermination" does exist. It is both illegal and immoral. But much has changed in this regard recently. Nevertheless, since this viewpoint prevails, it means that the blame lies with us, the blame lies with those officials from organs in the administration of justice who are guided by time-serving considerations rather than by the law. You see, the following also happens: An investigator is fully justified in taking a suspect into custody, while the court has equally weighty reasons not to deprive him of his liberty. A defendant's acquittal does not mean automatic punishment for the investigator. But it used to be so. People were arrested on flimsy grounds, and the sentences passed were copied from the indictment. As a matter of fact, it is less than 1 year since I was appointed city prosecutor, and I will therefore speak only of the latest data. Some 18.3 percent of people sentenced in Moscow in 1987 were arrested not by prosecutors but on the basis of sentences or court orders.

And now about the law. It prescribes that arrest should be chosen as the measure to ensure appearance in court in cases when there are grounds to assume that the suspect might either abscond, or commit another crime, or obstruct the investigation.

[Feofanov] But not only in these cases. So far, so good. The vagueness, in my view, lies in the fact that a prosecutor may place someone in pre-trial custody even without any of these reasons.

[Baranov] True, this measure to ensure appearance in court is applied in cases of crimes for which deprivation of liberty for more than one year is stipulated.

[Feofanov] But this covers virtually the entire Criminal Code.

[Baranov] Maybe one year is indeed a "low threshold." But the principle here is this. Detention in custody can be applied to individuals who have committed crimes that are dangerous for society (murder, rape, robbery, extortion, major embezzlement, malicious hooliganism—the list is set by law) with the gravity of the crime as the sole criterion.

[Feofanov] But if the prosecutor feels certain that the suspect will not abscond anywhere, will not obstruct anyone, why the mandatory detention in custody?

[Baranov] Have you given some thought to the victim? If I were not to detain a murderer in custody, would people understand me? It would be immoral, if you like, to leave a dangerous criminal at liberty, provided of course the evidence against him were serious. I would not put it the way you did: An arrest is necessary when the individual "must be arrested." This is demanded by the law, by elementary fairness to the victim, and by the interests of exposing a criminal. Yes, a prosecutor must exercise extreme caution before issuing an arrest warrant. But he must look in both directions, as it were: He must avoid "predetermining," as you put it, the suspect's fate in court, but he must not let the criminal slip away, either. Take thefts from apartments for example. There are circumstances which do not always allow the swift collection of proof of guilt in every case. Add to this the mediocre professional standards of investigators, the "index" requirements, and you can imagine a prosecutor's position. On the one hand the suspect comes festooned with dozens of episodes of theft, but on the other hand not all episodes can be proved beyond doubt. And "on the third hand" you have the victims' complaints about our sluggishness.

[Feofanov] Does this mean that the citizens who fall into the hands of the investigators are responsible for the "standard of these investigators?"

[Baranov] No, any case of unjustified arrest always lies on a prosecutor's conscience. I am not complaining about fate, I am just stating facts.

[Feofanov] The supreme act of justice, I assume, is to acquit a defendant. After all, the court is not there for the sole purpose of passing sentence, the main point is to deliberate and arrive at the truth. But hitherto we have considered acquittal as something unusual. Yes, investigation appears unimportant in the wake of an acquittal, it is hard to force unskilled or unconscientious officials to rejoice at the triumph of justice. But it is necessary to force them to apologize publicly, to restore all the rights of the acquitted person, to repair as much as possible to damage done to him by the state. But an acquittal in our country occurs almost in secret, especially if the prosecutor discontinues the case. It seems to me that it is the prosecutor's duty to see through to its conclusion the complete restoration of all the rights of the acquitted person, including his official position. Alas, we still receive letters in which acquitted persons describe their tribulations as regards restoration.

[Baranov] It could be said that if there were no acquittals there would be no courts in the broad sense of the word. But, in my opinion, the court itself is at times afraid of acquitting. We spent a lot of time on a case involving a traffic accident which resulted in a death. In our view, the investigation was conducted to the full, but the assessment of guilt was contradictory. What was to be done? We decided: Let the court pass final judgment. The case was remitted to us for further investigation. We will probably drop it. And the victim will complain. But an acquittal by the court, in an atmosphere of openness and glasnost, would have dotted all the "i's."

At present, when an investigator discontinues a case, he sends a copy of the resolution to the prosecutor and notifies the accused and the victim in writing. In practice everything seems to be correct, but even so, attempts are often made to create obstacles and that is a fact. Copies of the resolution to discontinue the case are not provided. There is unwillingness to make all the material available, and so on. You know how difficult it is to demolish something that is established. A decree on compensation for damages suffered by a citizen through illegal actions was adopted 18 May 1981. The Code on Criminal Procedure made it incumbent upon inquiry organs, investigators, prosecutors, and courts to take measures to compensate such damage. Alas, nothing gets done automatically. New thinking in the administration of justice is still not governing its actions. Even so, we are striving to do away with the practice of keeping silent about the results of investigations and to demolish the obstacles as regards compensation for damage. Workers of the Prosecutor's Office in the capital make it their rule to visit labor collectives and academic collectives and to frankly report on the results of an investigation whenever the issue concerns the restoration of the good name of someone who, as you once put it, had fallen between the millstones of the administration of justice. But the full restoration of rights—at work, in public organizations, in the eyes of neighbors and acquaintances, and so on—is a very difficult job. We do not have such a properly tuned up mechanism: There must be a well thought out system of measures.

[Feofanov] Our conversation has been running along the criminal track. This is understandable: This is where people suffer most tangibly from illegal actions. But let us look at our daily life. Much is being said now about arbitrary departmental norm-setting which infringes citizens' rights. And what about the legality of acts passed by the capital's ispolkom? In terms of its population, our city is equivalent to a whole country. I would be probably right in saying that a visitor, client, or customer in a store, restaurant, railroad station, cultural institution, and so on and so forth is forced to ingratiate himself with everybody, from the doorkeeper or sales girl upwards. Yes, the main evil probably lies in those thrice accursed shortages. But this makes it even more necessary for the prosecutor's eye to be that much more vigilant and for the measures to prevent official arbitrariness to be that much tougher. You might object and say that it is impossible to keep an eye on everything. But even so, there must be supervision to ensure that we can exercise our rights without humiliating begging.

[Baranov] Yes, there are plenty of conflicts there. And, as a rule, the service workers emerge as "victors." I agree, the thrice accursed shortages do have an effect. The prosecutor, just like any other Muscovite, knows very well that a newsstand vendor sells popular journals from under the shelf, just like store salesmen do with a rare book or a fashionable suit of clothes; a waiter keeps a table reserved for his regular clients, a ticket salesman is the benefactor of the chosen few. What is the position of prosecutor's supervision here? It is very difficult to give an unambiguous answer. Much lies outside the scope of the law. This must be the concern of economic leaders in the first place. They do, of course, react. But many orders and instructions contain general calls like "measures must be taken," "work must be done."

No, we are not indifferent. The prosecutor's office investigated 1,520 citizens' reports of violations in the trade network system, and this alone revealed 852 cases of defraudation of customers or sale of substandard goods. Cases of overcharging, extortion, and bribery were established in many enterprises under the Moscow City Main Administration for Markets, the Moscow City Main Administration for Motor Car Transport, the Main Administration for Public Catering, and the Moscow City Main Administration for the Fruit and Vegetable Industry. It is alarming that all this is happening before the very eyes of the service sphere leaders and at times even with their tacit agreement. Efforts by the Moscow Gorispolkom, which is actively striving to correct the situation, have failed to produce any noticeable results so far.

[Feofanov] I know that the Prosecutor's Office has more than enough on its plate. But don't you think, Lev Petrovich, that there has been a certain shift of emphasis in your activity: The supervision of the exercise of citizens' rights is no longer the main point? And not necessarily of respectable citizens' rights. Ultimately, vagrants and loose girls are also citizens. They should, of course, be punished whenever they break the law. But it does happen that moral judgment seems to deprive even the best citizens of their rights. As for the others, "there's no point in standing on ceremony." Unfortunately, this attitude is firmly rooted in us all. But if a prosecutor holds such a view, he is simply in no position to properly perform his lofty duties as guardian of the law—after all, all are equal before him. They must be equal.

[Baranov] Indeed, at times we cannot seem to look beyond statewide interests and see an individual. And this must be done, regardless of who is before you. More than likely, people who have dropped out of the healthy social environment and require special attention ought to be treated with humane strictness and, maybe, more sympathetically. I think that this must be done by Prosecutor's Office workers so that they do not lose sight of, nor forget, the fact that our entire activity is aimed at defending the citizens' interests. Ultimately, the object of the application of our efforts is man with all his difficulties and problems.

The problem which you defined as "citizen's right and prosecutor's duty" cannot be examined from just one angle. Let us look at the Constitution. Article 39 says that "citizens of the USSR enjoy in full the social, economic, political, and personal rights and freedoms...." And the second part of this article reads: "Enjoyment by citizens of their rights and freedoms must not be to the detriment of the interests of society or the state, or infringe the

rights of other citizens." This is why we must bear the following in mind: The law protects the interests of citizens suspected of having committed a crime, but it also protects the rights of citizens who suffered from that crime.

I can only repeat that, when examining the interlinking of the ideas of "citizen's rights" and "prosecutor's duties" it is necessary to perceive their unbreakable unity with statewide interests, in other words with the supreme expression of the interests of every individual.

Restructuring of Legal System Viewed

PM2005101388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Democracy and the Law. The Course of the Restructuring of the Legal System Worries Readers"]

[Text] Letters to the editorial office sometimes put a direct question: "Why is it proving difficult to introduce democratic principles into the legal system?"

Let us state bluntly: There are grounds for such a question. Violations of socialist legality are being overcome more slowly than people would like, and instances are encountered where legality for a jurist—whether judge, prosecutor, or investigator—is determined by what the local party or soviet leader said.

Of course, it was not today or yesterday that this situation came about in the juridical sphere. The party has already spoken openly and fully of the need for the legal system to switch as quickly as possible to the path of democratization, humanization, and glasnost. Much has been done in this direction since April 1985. The spirit of democracy imbues the Law on the State Enterprise, on the nationwide discussion of important questions of state law, on individual labor activity, and others. A draft of fundamentally new criminal legislation and of laws on glasnost and the press is being drawn up, and a law on cooperatives is being prepared. At the same time, many departmental normative acts and instructions, which used to fetter creative initiative, the independence of economic planners and labor collectives, and their desire to achieve the economy's accelerated upsurge and the development of the social sphere, are being repealed and revised. In short, the concept of a socialist legal state is consistently being elaborated and implemented.

A start has been made on the great work which has to be done in the course of restructuring the legal system. For it is important not only that the law itself be good but also that it be implemented efficiently.

The question of jurists' true, and not merely rhetorical, independence is an acute one in this connection. Of course, much here depends on their personal principledness, commitment, and competence. But we also need legislative guarantees that a judge will not be "blackballed" for a subsequent term because of his "intractability," for example, and that an investigator who refuses to institute a criminal case on orders from above will not lose his job. There has long been discussion of questions of bringing the attorney into the criminal process from the moment a person is charged or arrested and of widening the composition of the judicial collegium to examine cases in particularly complex or socially significant categories.

All these are fundamental problems. The observance of citizens' rights and interests and the development of democratic principles in the legal system depend on their correct solution. Therefore we cannot get away here with "cosmetic" half-measures, as previously. But it is also inadmissible to defer resolving the problems. Yet if we speak not of words but of practical actions, the leadership of law enforcement organs is in no particular hurry over restructuring.

Take, for example, working people's complaints and appeals. Repeated mention has already been made of the unjustifiably labyrinthine bureaucratic procedure for the examination of complaints and of the fact that complaints are checked by certain people while the replies are signed by others who do not, in practice, know the essence of the matter. But the chief point is that complaints are considered without their originators or attorneys being present—which completely deprives this process of its adversarial and thus democratic character. The need to revise this approach was mentioned in the article "Appeal Against Sentence" published in PRAVDA 8 months ago. But the editorial office has still not received an official response to it. Perhaps the author was wrong in the way he put the question? He was right, it turns out. This was confirmed by responsible representatives of the union Ministry of Justice, Prosecutor's Office, and Supreme Court in a PRAVDA "roundtable" discussing problems of democratization and legality. What is the matter? Why no response from competent law enforcement organs? For the deadline for this laid down by the law long ago expired.

Of course, restructuring in the legal system is a complex matter. It is inadmissible to careen from one extreme to the other here. But neither must we passively wait for ideal conditions to observe legality. It is necessary to create them, search day by day for new approaches and creative solutions, and disseminate the experience of the best. Where people act in just this way the situation in the legal sphere is far more favorable than in the country as a whole.

S. Vinokurov, for example, has been working for 7 years as prosecutor in Kiev City's largest rayon—Minskiy Rayon. Over the past 7 years not a single violation of legality in the investigation of criminal cases has been recorded in the rayon. An exception to the rule? But it could become the norm if every prosecutor made it a rule, as S. Vinokurov does, to personally study the

materials of a criminal case before sanctioning an arrest and then to have a talk with the accused or the suspect, at the same time interpreting all doubtful circumstances in his favor, as the presumption of innocence requires. As you see, there is no special secret. But, oh, how rarely we encounter such careful, principled work by prosecutors. There are, unfortunately, still many prosecutors who have not yet learned how to fulfill their professional duty in full.

The democratization of the legal system is inconceivable without strengthening the population's legal awareness. In order to carry out the law, it is necessary to know it. The organization of universal basic legal education is a very important task connected with enhancing the working people's legal awareness and sociopolitical activeness. Everyone must understand that legality and conscious discipline are an inalienable part of genuine democracy. Democracy does not exist outside the law or above the law, the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum pointed out.

Yet some people are not averse to interpreting the democratic transformations in the course of restructuring as total license and using them for ambitious, egoistic purposes. Let us recall the recent events in and around Nagorno-Karabakh. Are abandoned machine tools and empty student auditoriums really a sign of democracy? Or the bandit-like manifestations in Sumgait—do they benefit restructuring? No, and again no! Like cases, of which there are many, when people locally shelter behind preformed public opinion and use it to make short work of unwelcome people and to assert the higher viewpoint.

It is the duty of party, soviet, and legal organs to resolutely stand guard over democratic principles and actively oppose any deviations from the norms of law and morality. And then people, on seeing this, will not agonize over the question: "Why is it proving difficult to introduce democratic principles into the legal system?" For the answer to it will be right before their eyes. It is necessary always to remember one of the conclusions of the 27th CPSU Congress: Democracy was and still is a very important lever for strengthening socialist legality, and strong legality is a guarantee of the development of democracy, restructuring, and glasnost.

Academic Comments on Criminal Law Reform

PM1905140988 PRAVDA in Russian
14 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with Prof G. Minkovskiy by V. Polyakov under the rubric "Toward the 19th All-Union Party Conference": "The Law Must Offer Protection"; date and place not given—first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] "The power of the people is the complete, undivided triumph of laws expressing their will." This extremely unambiguous formula was voiced at the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum. The whole question, as many readers write to us, is the degree to which the legislative complex corresponds to the dynamics of life, restructuring processes, and democratic trends in present-day society. This was the subject of our conversation with Prof G. Minkovskiy, honored RSFSR scientist, experienced lawyer, and one of the people involved in preparing new criminal legislation.

[Polyakov] Genrikh Mikhaylovich, it would probably not be inappropriate to ask what prompted the review of criminal legislation. "Our society has obviously long been in need of this," S. Kyazimov from Baku wrote to PRAVDA, for example.

[Minkovskiy] The restructuring processes have forced us to implement a range of legislative measures to ensure that the safeguarding of legality and the protection of citizens' rights meet the requirements of the time. I would single out the following points here. First: The fundamentals of our criminal legislation were adopted more than 25 years ago. Naturally they have "aged." You cannot get away with making individual changes and additions in the new conditions. Second, there must be serious changes in the attitude to applying laws in practice. The new fundamentals must shake up practice, so to speak. Legal regulation is now changing its thrust: Instead of the principle that you can do anything that has been authorized, we are introducing the principle that you can do anything that is not prohibited.

[Polyakov] It is all a question of the number of prohibitions...

[Minkovskiy] That is the whole point—there are going to be far fewer. But they will have to be really substantiated—fulfilled, in other words. Finally, third, experience of changes in criminal legislation and of the application of new legal norms has been accumulated in recent years. In the RSFSR, for example, approximately half of the criminal code norms in force before 1982 have been changed. The main thrust—to eliminate excessive repression and ensure differentiation and individualization—was undoubtedly right. At the same time certain controversial decisions emerged. The operation of some of norms is fading; inevitably, given the frequent "clarifications," discrepancies have emerged between the penalties for some crimes.

[Polyakov] "To what extent," Muscovite P. Kostrov asks, "is the decision to review criminal legislation connected with tendencies for crime to increase?" Can the question be formulated in this way?

[Minkovskiy] No, on the contrary, there is a drop in crime as a whole, serious crime included. The latter is particularly important, as the registration of serious crime is as comprehensive as possible and so, on the basis of change in this area, we can monitor the real change in the level of crime as a whole. I think that these

changes are linked to a considerable extent to the measures to combat drunkenness and alcoholism, as one in two or one in three crimes in recent years (and nine out of ten cases of hooliganism) were connected with drunkenness.

This does not mean that there are no problems, of course. There is a definite increase in crime among young people. Trends in economic and official crime are complex and the level of recidivism is high, including during the serving of sentences. We are now faced with an urgent need to fight crime on the basis of a forecast plan (not everyone remembers that the first 5-year plan contained a section on combating social anomalies). And, of course, statistics relating to crime and transgressions of the law must be opened up at last. Glasnost on this question must be an integral part of the process of democratizing our society. We also need this for purposes of counterpropaganda, because comparative analysis shows that the state of affairs in our country is qualitatively better. In the FRG and Britain there are 16-18 burglaries per 1,000 population each year. You will have to take my word for it that in our country there are fewer crimes in this area.

[Polyakov] What fundamentally new tenets of criminal law theory and what results of the generalization of accumulated experience merit attention, in your view, during work on the new criminal legislation?

[Minkovskiy] I would mention the following issues. First, it is necessary to step up the extent to which criminal legislation reflects the party-state concept of combating crime in our society. After all, this is not a problem for the prosecutor's office or the militia but part of the domestic policy of the party and the government. Crime represents unproductive flaws in our society—demographic, economic, and ideological. The fight against crime in this sense has a direct impact on every element of restructuring—the economy included. Suffice it to say that, according to specialists, each violent death of a member of our society is equivalent to a loss of up to R40,000 in the country's economic potential (if you proceed from the average contribution by a member of society to its development). Or take, for example, the following estimate of the average loss resulting from just one burglary in a large city—as much as R2,500! What about speculation? Minimum estimates indicate that "business" people fleece their fellow citizens of about R1.5 billion every year. This is equivalent to the annual turnover of such a major trade firm like Moscow's GUM and all its branches.

In this respect it seems necessary to ensure that the new criminal legislation consolidates the development of the system of its legal and political principles. The occupational hazard of staffers of law enforcement organs is often that they can no longer see the political implications of their work. Formal performance indicators—the number of completed cases, the number of cases returned for further investigation, and so forth—become an end in themselves. I think that the incorporation in criminal legislation of political characterizations of the principles of criminal law's fight against crime will help to eradicate formalism in the application of criminal law.

[Polyakov] "The list of punishments requires substantial reform. Don't you feel that it would be better to broaden the range of milder sentences than to imprison people as we do now?" This question was asked by R. Merkulov from Karaganda.

[Minkovskiy] There is considerable sense in this. I think that some socialist states' experience of employing in criminal proceedings measures such as involvement in socially useful work in free time and short-term arrest (from several days to 1-2 months) seems interesting in this regard. The use of this kind of measure would make it possible to sharply reduce the number of sentences known to be ineffectual, whereby a person is sent to a colony for a term of up to 1 year and, as a result, under the law on early release, he gains his freedom almost before he has lost it.

[Polyakov] The question of the advisability of the death penalty is being very keenly discussed at present in society....

[Minkovskiy] When discussing the question of the death penalty a substantive analysis—sociological and social-psychological—is needed, not just the emotions in which the discussion has abounded, for example, in one popular weekly and later in the program "Views." The question of substantially reducing the range of cases where this measure can be applied should certainly be discussed. Not only minors, pregnant women, and mothers of young children should be exempted from the possibility of receiving this sentence, but women and old people generally. Regarding the possibility of the immediate total abolition of capital punishment (80-85 percent of the population object to this on the basis of various "criteria"), thereby becoming the 30th of the 130 states on whose criminal legislation we have information to abolish it, I would cite two cases. Some time ago we broke up a group of bandits, some of whom had 2-5 previous convictions. For a number of years this armed gang, which operated in the North Caucasus, had committed attacks and murders. They were responsible for 15 murders alone, not counting other crimes.

Another example. Another, no less dangerous gang known as the "drivers" operated in the south of the RSFSR. In the course of 1 year they committed more than 25 murders. So what penalty that would guarantee people's safety if they happened to be travel to the south would the aforementioned journalists suggest in light of these case histories? In this connection I would like to remind you that in a discussion on the question of totally abolishing the death penalty, V.I. Lenin felt it necessary to quote a French lawyer who said that first the death penalty must be abolished by the murderers themselves.

Frankly, there are more fundamental problems we rarely discuss. I would like to mention work on a range of measures to replace criminal punishment (probation, referring the case papers to a comrades' court, and so forth). After all, in the twenties the proportion of sentences involving imprisonment (not counting short-term imprisonment) amounted to no more than 18-20 percent. Yet the situation was complex....

In my opinion, the question of necessary defense in extremity is still a serious issue. As is the question of regulating the limits for the use of force and weapons when arresting criminals. I think that many decrees conferring awards on staffers of law enforcement organs would not be "posthumous" if we succeeded in improving the formulation of the appropriate norms.

[Polyakov] Quite a number of people are now suggesting the introduction of new prohibitions under criminal law. How do you feel about this problem?

[Minkovskiy] I believe that prohibitions should be socially conditioned. That is the first point. Second, they must be realistic. For example, in our country every 24 hours citizens make some 400-450 million purchases from state and cooperative trade outlets. Is a ban on deceiving customers under criminal law realistic? I think not. We would have to institute millions of criminal cases every day. Meanwhile senior legal experts say that an ineffectual law is worse than no law at all, as it makes you accustomed to the idea that it can be ignored. In my opinion, we need to differentiate penal measures, reserving criminal responsibility for malicious cases. Or, for example, a few years ago the illegal teaching of karate was made a criminal offense. But did the number of negative cases justify the need to introduce a prohibition under criminal law? And why was the illegal teaching of other forms of martial arts not made an offense? Proposals to establish criminal liability for selling fruit and vegetables for more than the state price have recently appeared and have even been discussed at scientific conferences. Do the authors of these proposals realize that they are essentially trying to ban kolkhoz market activity?

At the same time, however, there are some proposals which, in my opinion, merit serious discussion. For example, suggestions concerning criminal liability for abduction and the introduction of criminal responsibility for prostitution (this is already the case in Hungary, Poland, the GDR, and other socialist countries) were submitted. L. Konopleva, a teacher from Kursk, and N. Pestyakov, a technician from Saratov, have written to PRAVDA about this.

Regarding proposals to increase the liability of mothers who refuse to carry out their duty to bring up and support their children, this is, of course, not a question of criminal responsibility: It is enough to impose maintenance payments. And, I repeat, in every case there must be a broad, public discussion. In my opinion, the problem of public discussion generally is now a key problem, as is the problem of sociological research, as the basis for any changes in the law. We cannot draw up new legislation without considering the opinions of millions of citizens. This is a postulate of restructuring in all areas of our life—the legal mechanism included.

Danger of 'Vulgar Stalinism' Described

PM2305082188 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 19, 8 May 88 p 3

[Natalya Ivanova article: "Fear And Risk"]

[Text] As our society proceeds towards democratization, as glasnost increases, a fear of liberation is emerging. This fear assumes different forms. There is an honest way of admitting one's unpreparedness. But this fear causes some to cling stubbornly to myths, to resurrect the seemingly life-saving pseudo-authorities. You remember the reasoning of Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor: "There is no trouble more unceasing and tormenting for a person than, once he has been set free, the frantic search for an object of worship."

SOVETSKAYA KULTURA published a letter which, in its own way, is characteristic. The reader suggests that a society in defence of Stalin be set up. There have also been articles defending Stalin—and using Winston Churchill. I couldn't believe my eyes when I read this verse about Russia: "This bulk cannot be raised without victims." A person who evidently considers himself a poet and a patriot notes with satisfaction "the creak of the rack" in his people's history. After DRUZHBA NARODOV published a series of poems by Bulat Okudzhava, in which the anti-hero was Stalin, the magazine was deluged with indignant letters from readers who felt insulted for the leader. The danger for society isn't just Stalinism of officialdom, the danger is also Stalinism of the masses, vulgar Stalinism so to speak. Poet Oleg Chukhontsev wrote elequently about the fusing of everyday consciousness with Stalinism. In his grotesque "The Double" he combined the disconnected consciousness of a shoeblack with the thoughts of his countryman about the "great purge."

What has given rise to this phenomenon? Social dissatisfaction? Breaking away from the years of stagnation with their corruption, mafiosity and depravity? Slavish thirst for a firm hand? Deformation of social life? The myth about "the simple, the stern, our own beloved" become a kind of refuge for ordinary consciousness. It is difficult and painful to destroy the stereotypes of this consciousness. Fear is the main legacy, a chronic disease. Fear of reality and innovation is a kind of socio-historical fear of open doors. This fear is paradoxically combined with aggression, with what the classical writer called "administrative delight." With the desire to suppress an alien viewpoint. With "prohibitive" ideology which defends by means of labels a mythologized idea about the "image of the enemy."

NOVYY and NEVA had only just published poems by Nobel Prize winner Joseph Brodsky, who was made to leave his country during the stagnation period, when KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA came out with a contemptuous piece about the poet. This was no objective analysis of Brodsky's poems by P. Gorelov, on staff at the Institute of World Literature. It was a tendentious and insulting dissection of isolated lines and words. Prompted not by the desire to examine the complexities of Brodsky's poetry, but by administrative protection, Gorelov's accusations resemble the off-hand commentary on Brodsky's poetry in the Munich edition of VECHE. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reprinted that commentary and described VECHE as a "magazine of the Russian national association in the FRG."

Reading the latest publications in the literary magazines—L. Chukovskaya's story "Sofya Petrovna," written in 1939, about the horrifying enlightenment of a woman who was convinced that "people are not arrested in vain," V. Grossman's polyphonic novel Life and Fate about the people's heroism and man's tragic search for inner freedom under authoritarian rule, and B. Yampolskiy's novel Moscow Street about the fear of persecution that grips a frontline veteran in the late 1940—we find dramatic and painful knowledge. The reader can't relax, can't lounge in his armchair or have a cup of tea with jam. He feels disturbed and uncomfortable. But the only way to combat myths and stereotypes is by surgical intervention, by shining a bright spotlight where darkness or reticence reigned. Today literature is shaping the history of society at its own risk, running ahead of the scholars. It is emancipating the mythologized consciousness.

Indeed, we find it difficult to part with those stereotypes which are in our blood. Take terms—a mysterious sphere of our cultural life. As is generally known, the literary term "socialist realism" was coined in the early 1930s. Unfortunately, it did not spur development but became a barrier to creative freedom. Hundreds of monographs have been published and dissertations defended, but today, when the literary facade has crashed to the ground before our eyes, it has to be admitted that the volumes on the history of our literature are inconsequential and do not reflect the reality. No matter how hard new theoreticians try to breathe life into artificial terms by sacrificing obsolete works, their efforts strike me as particularly dogmatic, an attempt to protect themselves and their consciousness in the face of changing reality.

Wouldn't it be better to just come right out and admit it? And begin working without guarantees?

Weekly's Readers Discuss Andreyeva Letter

PM2005130188 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 18, 1 May 88 p 11

[Report on roundtable discussion of MOSCOW NEWS readers and excerpts from readers' letters: "Principles Versus the Truth"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Articles by Aleksandr Levikov ("MN" No. 13, 1988) and Lyudmila Saraskina ("MN" No. 15, 1988) - Re Nina Andreyeva's controversial letter "I can't give up my principles" concerning Stalin and Stalinism published March 13 in "SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA" - elicited a spirited response from our readers. We invited some of them - student Olga Antonova, laboratory assistant Aleksandr Vaysberg, turner Boris Danilov, porter Aleksandr Malinovskiy, barber Mikhail Mochan, programmer engineer Marina Morozova, student Dina Oborina, process engineer Valeriy Pukov, and teacher Vladimir Chebotarevn - to join in interspersed with excerpts from the letters of other readers.

"The passions on the subject of Stalin and the history of the USSR are raging and will continue to rage for a long time. There will always be two sides in the argument - those who hate Stalin and those who served him honestly with all their heart." (S. Kozlov, chemical engineer, Moscow.)

MN: Therefore, we have two sides in the debate about Stalin, which is at the crux of Andreyeva's ideological platform. Today, when a lot has been written about her article, we'd like to know more about how readers respond to the processes in our society discussed by Andreyeva and what she advocates.

M. Morozova: I think that quite a few people think the way Andreyeva does - they're to be found in management, in the army and in the militia. We've avoided speaking about them for some time. We don't even know about Shchelokov's (Minister of Internal Affairs under Brezhnev) crimes. But it is precisely people of this kind who readily say that under Stalin everything was in order, whereas now there is disorder. No one defends Brezhnev. But Stalin is described as an alternative to slipshodness and corruption, and his personal modesty is cited as a model, while no mention is made of how many dachas and guards he had, of what his pathological cruelty cost the country.

"No one was arrested in the workers' settlement where I used to live in the 30s. Ordinary people lived in peace then. They believed in their leader Comrade Stalin, who had received Russia with a wooden plough and left it with a nuclear bomb. If Stalin were alive today, our country would have the highest standard of living in the world for the ordinary people. Stalin would have told us briefly and simply: 'My countrymen, we, the Winner-People, cannot be in second or third place - let's take first!' And we'd have taken it!" (N. Tsvetkov, Moscow.)

D. Oborina: I'm surprised that Andreyeva's letter appeared so late. Perestroyka is in its third year, but until now there were no obvious, open attacks against it. In spite of my negative reaction to Andreyeva's letter, I think that the appearance of such a manifesto is productive: it seemed to many people that our movement had no enemies. But they do exist.

MN: Such a clear-cut programme as Andreyeva's could hardly have appeared at the start of perestroyka's. Then the people who believed in perestroyka's success were few and far between. Many thought: it's just talk. The appearance of such a programme proves that perestroyka has achieved a lot and started to pose a real threat to those for whom it is unprofitable. It is significant that Andreyeva's letter appeared three months before the Party Conference, which is to discuss our political system and decide the country's destiny. This forced the opponents of Perestroyka to take their own measures.

"All those who oppose the fresh winds of change, who used the 'sinecure' of socialism - they will all be for Andreyeva's letter, for non-exposure of Stalin and his regime, and for calling people names. The distortions, shifts in meaning and half-truths - all that is the usual muck. All this has appeared precisely before the Party Conference in order to influence those who haven't yet made up their minds, who are vacillating and waiting." (A group of physicists from Gorkiy.)

MN: Andeyeva's letter was mainly addressed to students. How did they respond?

D. Oborina: We students have begun to feel fundamental changes, to feel our independence. None of my friends are against perestroyka.

"Could it be that Stalin did nothing positive? After all, it wasn't a gang of criminals he headed for 30 years, but the biggest state in the world. If everything was as it is being depicted in the press these days, and Stalin was simply a tyrant and a despot, then it turns out that our parents were deceived, we were deceived and our children will be deceived." (Petrova, engineer, Moscow.)

B. Danilov: I spent the first days of war at the Leningrad Front. We sincerely come over the top with the words: "For the Motherland, for Stalin". After the 20th Congress, our consciousness started to change. But not all at once. We were already adults and it was hard to change. At first I defended Stalin, found arguments. But later on I overcame the dogmas which I had regarded as principles. For the sake of the truth. By the 60s I didn't believe in Stalin anymore. Neither do I wish to reject the truth now.

MN: It is worth noting not only the contents of Andreyeva's anti-perestroyka platform, but its form: a letter from a private individual published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA'S "Debates" column. Why then did the press stay silent for three entire weeks? Whom were they afraid of? Why did it take an article - an editorial no less - in the central Party paper (PRAVDA, April 5) to refute one person's opinion? Apparently, someone who wants to do his own political business under her name. Someone who wants to use private emotions and views, maybe even sincere ones, for his own ends. Let those who are behind Andreyeva declare themselves and their line, let them openly declare their disagreement with Mikhail Gorbachev's course. Then the debate with Andreyeva, with which the entire press is busy today, would be justified.

A. Malinovskiy: What leaps to the eye? That an entire page is devoted to a letter under the heading "Debates" - yet there isn't a single article in the paper debating the author's opinion.

I think that the views expressed by Andreyeva can be overcome only by the expansion of glasnost. Big changes have occurred in our life in the last two years - discussions of history and culture, publication of formerly forbidden books and the emergence of unofficial organizations. At the same time glasnost is not total: there are still forbidden zones....

A. Vaysberg: Andreyeva's letter is, if properly analyzed, a collection of weak declarations which can be easily disproved. But one should be allowed to refute any point of view, even one occupying an entire newspaper page. Readers know that if an article takes up a whole page, it must have some kind of backing....

B. Danilov: Perestroyka's opponents have become franker. Last year a letter was published from a woman, the wife of an administrative worker, who predicted that perestroyka would go bust. The woman did not disclose her name. This year, a similar article was signed.

MN: Andreyeva's letter wasn't the first article of its kind to be signed. Remember Vyacheslav Gorbachev's article last year and the discussion of it in MOLODAYA GVARDIYA; this year's article in NASH SOVREMENNIK, in which critic Mikhail Lobanov, hailing the fall of NOVYY MIR under Tvardovskiy, spoke of the obsolete "liberal-progressive tendencies" which have exhausted themselves (sic!) and M.Malakhov's article in the April issue of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA. Now, after the PRAVDA editorial and other articles, people who think like Andreyeva have shut up again. The silence means that they are waiting for their time to come. And we must ask ourselves: how far along the road of renewal have we moved and how strongly are the guarantees against a revival of Stalinism?

M. Morozova: No one can provide such guarantees. We don't know anything for sure; we can only assume. If this person is mentioned, it means that liberalization is moving ahead. If that person is admonished, it means they're about to tighten the screws. And we are supposed to guess.

MN: Many people regarded Andreyeva's letter as an instruction. Perhaps because in recent decades the leadership's views were often conservative. Hence the habit of regarding such articles as the point of view of the

leadership. And still we have, and we must have, different opinions. But where is the line over which our glasnost cannot step even in future? What rights do Stalinists have concerning the public expression of their views?

M. Morozova: I think that the discussion at all levels, the very top included, should be published so that everyone can know who stands for what.

A. Vaysberg: The "Memorial" group is collecting signatures for an appeal to the Supreme Soviet to build a monument to the victims of Stalin's repressions. As we see it, the memorial should include not only an architectural and sculptural complex, but also a museum, library, archives and possibly a research centre. Everything that could help foster an immunity to Stalinism in the public consciousness. The work being done by the press today in this area is of tremendous importance. Ordinary people's attitudes toward Stalin are increasingly negative - the signatures we have gathered show this.

MN: You used the word immunity. What are the mechanisms of immunity to Stalinism? You mentioned memory and signatures. What else? How can we avert a revival of Stalinism? Because evil possesses a magic, a force, which psychologically influences people. First of all, we need to deromanticize Stalin and his regime.

V. Pukov: Some forms of discussion help develop pluralism of opinion - the socio-political clubs. It would be nice if they could evolve freely and naturally and continue the dialogue between different points of view.

MN: One often hears that we are not ready for a democratic, law-abiding state.

M.Morozova: What is a law-abiding state? It is a state in which the laws are respected and observed. Engendering respect for the law and the habit of abiding by the law is a long process. People must be made to understand that the law is not something you can do as you like with.

V. Chebotarev: I talked to a literature teacher who discussed Andreyeva's letter with his 9th and 10th-graders - good and bright boys and girls. They said: we're fed up with hearing about the repressions. Why? Because everybody's beating around the bush. No one is providing precise statistics or facts. Glasnost must be broadened and deepened too.

MN: As long as we do not have the documents and evidence to prove that Stalinism is terror and violence, as long as we do not have all the data on this, it is hard to argue with Stalinists. The limits of glasnost in relation to Stalinism must be determined by the Constitution, which forbids the propaganda of terror and violence.

"'SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA' came out against the Party platform, against perestroyka. It is high time to name those who are guilty of violating the fundamental paragraphs in the Party Rules, an act that is inadmissible for a Communist and means that he should be expelled from the party. I'm not calling for repressions. Let them go and do work that corresponds with their anti-Party position. If the people at 'SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA' stay put, the fate of perestroyka will be in doubt." (Yu. Demidov, Moscow)

"Andreyeva's letter is exceptionally pro-Stalinist. Such publications sow discord in the minds of young people who have now awakened and are displaying a lively interest in the truthful, not the falsified, history of our country." (Valeriy Pochepko, teacher of scientific communism, Leningrad.)

O. Antonova: The phenomenon of Stalinism is much broader than the repressions and illegalities of the 30s-50s. It is a tenacious psychology, the essence of which is intolerance of any dissent or opposition, and a striving to monopolize power and ideology.

M. Mochan: Many people are talking about Andreyeva's letter. They quote what she said and what others said in response. But no one gives his own assessment! They give only the "information" and avoid drawing any conclusions! Even in our barber shop! They regard the ideological arguments in the press as an explosion of somebody's emotions.

Maybe we haven't yet grown used to, or breathed, freedom? I think this is the result of many decades when personal opinions didn't mean anything. People keep their opinions to themselves because for so long no one listened or cared what they thought.

B. Danilov: I don't like the fact that perestroyka is, as it were, a one-sided affair - for the leaders only. Perestroyka has not had much of an impact so far among workers.

A. Vaysberg: But if we remember how things were only three years ago, then our assessment of perestroyka will be absolutely different. One can see how far we've come.

M. Morozova: During the years of stagnation many people were condemned for criticism. They also need to be rehabilitated.

D. Oborina: I'm worried about the acknowledgement of errors. Read the book At the Kremlin Wall, published in 1988, which mentions not only Stalin but Vyshinskiy as well. The Kremlin wall is history, and let the people buried in it remain there. But there must be objective information about them.

V. Chebotaryev: I'd like to define the stages of perestroyka. In chemistry a diamond and graphite are one and the same substance. But they are different in every

way. What we had was graphite. Our task is to change that graphite, our social pattern, into a diamond. I'm sure that a diamond can be made.

MN: The people who have accepted perestroyka and are working for it hope that it will soon be possible to make a mighty breakthrough to a reasonable, just and democratic society.

Moscow TV Highlights Museum for Pasternak
OW2005131388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0305 GMT 20 May 88

["Restructuring Spotlight" program, presented by journalist Ionas Misyavichyus]

[Text] [Video shows study in the home of Boris Pasternak as audio provides recording of his voice reading poetry, then cutting to show Misyavichyus in a studio] [Misyavichyus] You have just watched a film showing the study of a giant of Soviet literature, Boris Leonidovich Pasternak. This study is in Peredelkino, in the home of Pasternak, but it looks quite different today. In other words it is absolutely empty.

For many years a struggle was waged to establish a Pasternak museum, and in today's program we would like to talk about this. In order to do this we invited Andrey Andreyevich Voznesenskiy, chairman of the Commission for Pasternak's Literary Heritage and well-known Soviet poet. [video zooms back to show Misyavichyus and Voznesenskiy in a studio with a projection television screen behind them]

[Voznesenskiy] I think that the tragic fate of Boris Leonidovich Pasternak, the great Russian lyricist and philosopher, the subsequent developments surrounding him, and the establishment of his museum were the first swallows to herald our literary perestroyka. First, you will recall the disgraceful 1958 decision of the Writers' Union [WU], which expelled the great Russian lyricist from that organization. Now that decision has been revoked.

[Misyavichyus] That occurred at the beginning of 1987, in February, I think?

[Voznesenskiy] Yes, that was when the Pasternak Commission began its work. Since then practically all works which were previously banned, have been published. But the question of the museum—keep in mind that 2 years have elapsed since the Congress—remained unresolved. It is as if we were pushing against a rubber wall. An unseen, and at times, unspecified resistance, was put up which did not permit the creation of the museum.

[Begin video recording] [Voznesenskiy] As you can see, the museum is closed for repairs. [video shows shots of Pasternak's home closed for restoration and Voznesenskiy and Misyavichyus standing near the gate] Therefore it is closed. It should not be closed for repairs. People should be able to drop in on Pasternak. He called this Neyasnaya Polyana [murky field; alluding presumably to Yasnaya Polyana (bright field), which was part of the Tolstoy estate]. Thousands of people have made their way here after discovering the address for themselves.

What happened at the Congress.... I remember beginning the conversation that a museum should be created here. Later, Yevtushenko, Likhachev, and other speakers, who were not particularly close to Pasternak, came out in support of this idea. [video shows Yevtushenko addressing the Writers' Congress; he is followed by Academician Likhachev]

[Yevtushenko] There were many appeals made by our writers' community and by our leading scientists to organize a museum at Pasternak's summer cottage [dacha], while the interior of the house was still the way it was while the poet was alive. This would include his personal belongings, library, and manuscripts. But despite all this, the Ministry of Culture, the secretaries of the USSR Writers' Union, the leadership of the Moscow writers' organizations, all these wonderful people [thunderous applause] never lifted a finger. First, there was an attempt to palm off Pasternak's empty summer house to some of our writers, but to their credit, all of them, without exception, refused. Under the cover of a standard bureaucratic reply, which camouflaged a secret desire to impose a procrustean solution, the Writers' Union secretariat made the decision to establish a general museum dedicated to all writers who have ever resided in Pasternak's house in Peredelkino, without bothering to invite not only the famous writers who have written letters on this matter, but even some of the secretaries of the Writers' Union.

Our poetry too is making a contribution to the great changes we are experiencing today. Today is a time of hope, of restoration of justice and restoring the human factor to a level of primary importance. This does not merely mean humane behavior toward the living, but also toward those who are no longer with us.

[Academician Likhachev] His museum is being rebuilt. Literary museums are centers for education. They are very important, particularly for the young. They are also very real. Even though there are 120 museums in the Russian Federation and many more throughout the Union—particularly since the smaller republics have done well with literary museums, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Georgia, Armenia, and others; Moscow, up till October, had numerous churches, which also serve as educational centers—one cannot speak in terms of having too many literary museums. We are not experiencing a museum boom, but a museum famine. [end recording]

[Voznesenskiy, in the studio] To this day the stereotypes, as if 1958 still lingers on, continue to exist. The stereotype of stagnation has not disappeared, and occasionally we may still read in the paper, say yesterday or the day before yesterday, and suddenly we read lines in an article

about Pasternak which are offensive, saying that his lyrics are provincial, that his lyrics are pedestrian. Just as if it was written in 1958. Time is marching on but all this lingers on. The same applies to the museum. This is a holy place. Here his collection of poetry was written, as well as a novel; here the gems, the masterpieces of Russian lyrics were written. Here, Svyatoslav Rikhter played at the frowned upon funeral. Certainly, these holy walls had to become a museum.

[Misyavichyus] Andrey Andreyevich, what, in your opinion, hindered the creation of a museum all these years.

[Voznesenskiy] Most certainly, first and foremost responsible for this was the formal psychology of the Literary Fund, which viewed this house as one of its ordinary summer houses. Finally, this stereotype was overcome. This took 18 months. One and a half years of articles, letters from authors, and finally, as summer replaced winter and then in turn was replaced by winter—while the museum remained empty—finally, just a few days ago, glad tidings came from the WU secretariat which said that it had decided to establish a museum in Peredelkino dedicated to Boris Pasternak. I would say that even this time this decision was not easily reached. The meeting was a very stormy one. It took considerable effort to convince opponents.

The question of establishing a museum is not limited to Pasternak alone. There is as yet no museum dedicated to Bulgakov, or to Akhmatova. I think that the time has come to dedicate a museum to Sergey Yesenin in Moscow, for even though he was born in Ryazan he was a poet of Moscow. Since we have begun speaking of Akhmatova and Zoshchenko , I would think that it is unrealistic and shameful that there still exists a resolution—it was never rescinded—which labels Akhmatova and Zoshchenko as depraved authors.

Let us return to Pasternak's summer house. Finally, the Writers' Union has given its consent and it seems that the RSFSR Ministry of Culture now has the final word. We are now awaiting a speedy reply from the RSFSR Ministry of Culture so that the museum will finally be open to the public. [Video cuts to shots of grounds, exterior, and interior of the house, then focuses on a sign attached to the gates which reads: "There will be a Pasternak museum here"]

Briefs

Belorussian SSR Appointment

The Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Artur Ivanovich Trutnev as deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers. Comrade Trutnev is a Belorussian; he was born in 1938. Since 1984 he has headed the Heavy Industry Department of the Communist party of Belorussia Central Committee. [Summary] *[LD1705021588 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 0415 GMT 14 May 88]*

Press Center Information

A new-generation automatic informat [informator] has been installed at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. Its task is to inform subscribers about the press center's program of work during the 19th all-union party conference. In terms of the majority of functions performed and its consumer possibilities, the new telephone apparatus, developed in a sectoral laboratory of the Moscow Communications Institute, conforms to world standards. Compared to the previous system, the volume of information put out has been increased more than five times. [Text] *[LD2005024888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 19 May 88]*

Economics

Abalkin Discusses Prospects for Reform

PM2005140388 Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 19, 9-15 May (Signed to Press 11 May 88) pp 2, 3

[Interview with Academician L.I. Abalkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute, by Yu. Rytov, under the rubric "Toward the 19th All-Union Party Conference": "Learning From Mistakes"; date and place of interview not given—boldface as published]

[Text] [Rytov] Leonid Ivanovich! It is well known that the restructuring of our economy is not being implemented as swiftly as we all would like it. What is happening: Good decisions have been made and laws passed, the role of the human factor has been boosted, but in actual fact....

[Abalkin] Decisions, even very good decisions, cannot change the situation by themselves. It is necessary to give up the naive faith in the power of decrees. A breakthrough can be achieved only when real economic relations develop. This is one of the lessons that must be firmly learned.

When we speak of the human factor and its growing role, for some reason we usually consider its influence positive. It is said that the human factor is bound to improve quality, overcome shortcomings, strengthen thrift and proper attitudes toward work, and so on.

But the human factor is a very complex and contradictory phenomenon. We cannot ignore the influence of such elements and features of the human factor as, for example, the inertia of our thinking or group egoism. Even phenomena like departmentalism and parochialism materialize, in one form or another, in people's actions. This is also part of the human factor.

[Rytov] Would you please try to assess our future prospects taking the human factor into account, despite all the complexities involved in such forecasting. Both the immediate and the longer-term prospects. Try to define the difficulties we are likely to encounter and the problems we will have to solve....

[Abalkin] It was clear from the very beginning, and now it is perhaps even more obvious, that restructuring is not a short-term campaign but a long-term program. Furthermore, we are already in a position to speak of restructuring as a certain stage, a full historical page in our society's development.

Its goals and the results we expect ought to be placed in a time context. We must be clearly aware of what we can achieve in the next 2, 3, or 5 years. And of what we must do to achieve this. We must have an equally clear idea of what is impossible to achieve in this time, neither in 2, nor in 3, nor even in 5 years. And of what will require considerably more time, 10-15 years.

It must be absolutely clear: Restructuring cannot be completed unless we ensure an upsurge in labor productivity. Nothing less than an upsurge will do. The same applies to the radical improvement of output quality. Of all output—from consumer goods to the most complex modern technology.

[Rytov] All this is true. But we also have tasks whose solution should under no circumstances be postponed for too long. These are primarily tasks concerning food, goods, housing.... What results can be expected here, and how soon?

[Abalkin] Yes, all these are matters which cannot be postponed until some time in the future. These problems must be energetically resolved.

What can we expect this year, in the next few years?

I must say this: It is evident that we cannot expect any radical changes in this sphere in the next few years. We cannot expect, for example, that this year there will be a substantial improvement in food supplies for the population, that the market will be saturated with consumer goods, or that noticeable social changes will occur.

Unfortunately, we are still lacking the levers and conditions which could ensure such a breakthrough.

What we can expect—and only in conditions of very persistent work—is that in the next 2-3 years we will have managed to complete the transition from uncoordinated measures for the restructuring of management and isolated steps in the management sphere to the creation of a more or less comprehensive and integral system with which to enter the nineties, the 13th 5-Year Plan period. Why do I say this?

Because only by creating a comprehensive system of new-style management will we be in a position to expect substantial positive changes, a swelling wave of improvements in all spheres of the economy.

But for the time being, while only individual elements of the new economic mechanism are coming into operation, we are simply not entitled to expect everything to improve at once.

Matters are somewhat different in the social sphere, where changes ought to be occurring already. And many of them are occurring already, although they may not always be tangible.

[Rytov] If you mean housing construction, the results are indeed not bad. Last year the population received 2.3 million new apartments with proper amenities, and the prescribed target was considerably exceeded....

[Abalkin] Yes, the volume of housing construction increased by 15 percent in the last 2 years. Of course, we would have all liked even greater growth. Nevertheless, after protracted stagnation a breakthrough is now under way.

I think it possible to expect that this process will advance along an ascending line this year and in subsequent years. It will also be given a boost by the expansion of the network of housing construction cooperatives and the development of individual housing construction, which will make it possible to attract additional funds and labor from the population itself.

I think the process of developing orchard farming and market gardening farms must develop equally intensively—after all, this gives the population an opportunity to acquire not only an additional quantity of fruit and vegetables but also a place where the entire family can spend its free time; it is also a form of socially beneficial leisure and, if you like, improvement of people's health. We have already started to make substantial advances here.

[Rytov] Today we are all placing great hopes in the cooperative movement, especially in the context of the Law on the Cooperative System which will soon be submitted for approval. How do you see the prospects in this area of the socialist economy?

[Abalkin] It is possible to expect quite rapid growth of the cooperative sector in the production of goods and services. Even though its relative share on the overall scale is still not too great, we must not forget: We are only just taking the initial steps.

But the pace at which these processes have started building up is very rapid. Suffice it to say that last year the number of people employed in cooperatives increased tenfold, from 15,000 to 150,000.

But everything will depend on the attitude which local authority organs will adopt toward this work. We must also take this factor into account in our forecasting.

The competitive element will be gradually intensified here, and this will insure better quality of services for the population and lower prices.

[Rytov] Many arguments have developed about the new rules for the taxation of cooperatives. What is your attitude toward this?

[Abalkin] These rules give rise to two types of serious doubt. The first applies to the sphere of rights and democracy. The question is: Is it legal to make a decision on the taxation of cooperatives while the draft Law on the Cooperative Movement is still subject to nationwide discussion? We are passing what is essentially an act of subsidiary legislation before the discussion is completed and the final text of the law is elaborated. We are thus introducing a fait accompli, as it were, into the discussion of the draft law.

I think we could have exercised patience for a matter of 2-3 months and made this decision after the nationwide discussion and in conformity with the Law on the Cooperative Movement.

The second doubt is a matter of real processes. We in the Economics Institute are thoroughly studying what is happening in the cooperative sector. We hold fairly regular meetings to discuss any problems that may arise with cooperative chairmen, simultaneously bringing to the "roundtable" representatives of the Ministry of Finance, the Gossnab, local authority organs, and legal services. This is an opportunity to compare different viewpoints.

The latest such discussion took place recently. The decision on the taxation of cooperative members' income was very seriously criticized. "Arguments" like the one that people want to grab as much as possible were not discussed at all. We talked about the upper limit of incomes, which we want to determine. Warning voices were heard: The new taxation system could produce extremely negative consequences.

Fears were expressed that this would lead not only to a decline in the volume of services but also to a decline in labor productivity. Those who addressed the meeting cited figures to prove that you only have to work for... 18 hours a week to earn the income over and above which greater restrictions apply. In this time it is perfectly possible to secure an income of R500. It is easy to see that the volume of goods produced and services will be sharply limited, and labor productivity will decline.

Particularly serious fears arise in connection with some cooperatives engaged in the sphere of intellectual activity: Scientific consultancy, the introduction of new developments, and so on. They could produce considerable benefits, or at least we hope so. Any restrictions on income regardless of the benefit produced will no doubt curb the quest for the most advantageous solutions.

In principle, there must be some regulation—there is no question about this. The taxation system is the normal system regulating economic mutual relations. Nor is there anything bad in the actual idea of a progressive tax. This is not a simple system, but it does place the processes which occur within a certain framework. The problem is how to apply it.

It can be proved both scientifically and on the basis of experience that a system of payments out of income into local budgets ensures a large amount of revenue at low tax rates.

How precisely? Very simply. If a limit is set on personal incomes, limiting them in fact to below a certain ceiling, output and services will be produced only in a volume sufficient to provide maximum earnings. If no such rigid limit is imposed, the [higher] volume of output and services (let alone the fact that there will be more of them for the population) would produce higher payments for budget revenues at lower tax rates.

In my view, the present decision on tax rates was made largely under the influence of emotions rather than on the basis of strict economic calculations. By emotions I mean the dissatisfaction among certain strata of the population with some types of cooperative services and with some cases of excessively high incomes earned by cooperative members.

Yes, such cases do occur and they cannot be ignored by idealizing the cooperative system. Nevertheless, when making important decisions, one cannot be guided only by moods and emotions. What we need are realistic calculations, the determination of economic expediency, and considered assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of actions to be taken, rather than impulsive decisions made under the influence of sentiments which are by no means always progressive.

It must be borne in mind that these sentiments are the product of the wage leveling mentality which was nurtured for decades. The attitude of certain circles of the population toward cooperatives either expresses this mentality or is largely based on it. It is impossible to ignore this aspect of the human factor, as I have already said. This aspect is not a manifestation of new thinking, it is the inertia of the old.

[Rytov] Let us turn back to forecasting the future economic situation. What can we expect from our state industry in the sphere of consumer goods production?

[Abalkin] Everything depends on how matters will develop in the future. In particular, on the way a contradiction we have encountered will be resolved. Specifically, the contradiction between the effect of the new conditions envisaged by the Law on the Enterprise and the existing inertia in attitudes.

What do I have in mind? Light industry has been given an opportunity to work directly on orders from the trade network. To produce only what is in demand among the population, and to conclude contracts at trade fairs only for that. This is one side of the coin. On the other side we have the old trends demanding of light industry certain growth rates and quantitative increases at any price, regardless of prevailing demand and its structure—as long as more is produced. This has a sharply negative effect on quality and results in the production of unnecessary goods which are not in demand.

If the second trend gains the upper hand, we can expect larger quantities of unsold goods and continuing market tension.

Even though the demands for quantitative growth are motivated by concern for the people's well-being, they represent yesterday's thinking and methods. They are remnants of the old edict system of management which did not produce anything good yesterday and is even less likely to produce anything good today.

Actual results will depend on how resolutely we are prepared—and I mean both planning and economic organs, both centrally and locally—to embark on unleashing initiative, on a real as opposed to a formal implementation of the Law on the State Enterprise.

This is why any forecast of market conditions will depend on the correlation between these trends. It is clear that, in the long run, we have no other option but to rely on progressive trends, unleash initiative, and ensure the production of output that is in demand among the population—by means of orders, trade network inquiries, and the eradication and rejection of everything that hinders this.

Insofar as real resistance still exists and will continue to exist, I would draw a very cautious conclusion: Changes in this sphere over the next 1-2 years will evidently be relatively small.

[Rytov] The same conclusion probably ought to be drawn regarding the sphere of food production?

[Abalkin] Various measures are currently being implemented—energetic and bold measures aimed at restructuring the work of agricultural enterprises, developing progressive forms like family contracts, introducing elements of leasing relations, and others.

There is just one goal: To achieve a breakthrough in a relatively brief period, over 2-3 years. This is why we can realistically expect substantial improvements in this sphere before the end of the eighties. But—and this must be bluntly said—they will hardly ensure any noticeable results this year.

There is a clearly detectable trend here: The curve of agricultural output growth, including livestock products, is now pointing upward. But the slope is still very gentle.

One more remark. It can be forecast that the food situation will develop differently in different regions in the country.

The point is that we must strictly adhere—figuratively speaking—to the tax in kind principle. Its essence is that once mandatory deliveries of output to the state stock of centralized resources have been effected, people at local levels—oblast, kray, or republic—are given an opportunity to deal independently with all the rest.

Local authority organs, for example, would be given an opportunity to channel this output totally into internal consumption, thus ensuring better food supples for local residents. Or to exchange it for different products from another region. Correspondingly, the share of output various regions receive from centralized stocks will remain unchanged, which is particularly important for consuming regions.

Therefore, the actual availability of food resources in a given region will depend only on local initiative, on local efforts, on local production of output, and on exchanges of this output with other regions in the country to ensure an adequate product variety.

Local attitudes toward this problem vary. The forces of inertia are also unequally distributed. And we would be right to forecast greater differentiation in regional food supplies. This is why it is necessary for the public to realize that primary responsibility for providing food and consumer goods and services for the population lies not with Moscow or the government but with local management organs.

[Rytov] This obviously imposes on them—on local management organs and local authorities—not only a responsibility but also a necessity for energetic actions?

[Abalkin] Of course. This is linked with our overall concept of democratization. At the local level we must elect leaders and demand of them work which satisfies the population. Otherwise, the leaders must be replaced if they cannot secure the results achieved in other regions. Thus they will really serve the people, their voters. The leadership must be staffed by people capable of expressing and upholding the population's interests, of mastering the situation and ensuring a breakthrough.

Initially, however—and I repeat this—we can only forecast stepped up differences in the solution of these questions in different regions of the country. This, I think, will serve as a kind of booster, a powerful accelerator for an overall change in the situation. Although, let me repeat, it will take time for people to perceive the new situation and become capable of attaining their goals in the process of self-management and subordination of local organs' activity to the genuine interests of the population.

[Rytov] Tell me then, Leonid Ivanovich, what—or who—is preventing the necessary steps from being taken? Generally speaking, we present a rather strange and contradictory picture. On the one hand, we proclaim absolutely correct and pressing ideas which have been arrived at through much hardship. On the other hand, as soon as it comes to implementing them, there immediately emerge all sorts of restrictions and doubts which distort these ideas beyond recognition. We proclaimed, for example, the independence of enterprises. We reduced it right away to zero by 100-percent state orders. We proclaimed a cooperative movement. We are destroying it right away by a precipitate tax system. Where is the logic? How are we to create a mechanism for making and implementing decisions which would rule out voluntarism and unnecessary emotions and would make it possible to implement ideas in their pure form, to resolutely and boldly move forward?

[Abalkin] First of all I would like to remark that many distortions occur not after decisions have been made but actually in the very process of their elaboration. There are substantial differences between various drafts as submitted for discussion and their final versions.

For example, when the draft USSR Law on the State Enterprise was being discussed, there was a provision that all depreciation funds allocated for the renewal of worn-out fixed assets would remain at the enterprise's disposal. After all, this is the minimum limit of self-financing. Without it there is not even simple reproduction. But the final version presented us with the following text: Depreciation funds remain at enterprises' disposal... in conformity with the prescribed normatives. This tiny editorial amendment did away with everything that the draft law provided and dealt a blow to self-financing. Since the right to set such normatives was vested mainly with ministries, this marked the beginning of redistribution processes, a flood of complaints about shortages of funds for renewal of worn-out assets, and so on.

Take another problem as an example. Much is being said now about state orders and the shortcomings accompanying their placement this year; you also deemed it necessary to mention this. Criticism of this practice is perfectly justified. Essentially this is just a different form, a different name for the traditional edict methods for notifying enterprises of their specific targets, since there are occasions when state orders cover virtually 100 percent of output.

But it must be bluntly said that, strange as it may seem, many of these actions are not against the law. This is because the final version relating to state orders proved quite contradictory and was the result of a certain compromise.

It is said, in particular, that state orders will be placed for the strategically and socially most important output, that they will as a rule be placed on a competitive basis and will envisage reciprocal responsibility by the parties. And yet, that same article, on that same page, says that state orders will be issued by higher-ranking organs and will be mandatory for enterprises.

[Rytov] Therefore, taking advantage of this, ministries still issue edicts to enterprises—they are higher-ranking, after all. And the enterprise must obey—it has no means of public protection. The arbitration service, on the basis of that same paragraph of the law, refuses to accept suits filed by production collectives.... In other words, a vicious circle.

[Abalkin] Perfectly correct. This is a very important lesson for the future.

First of all, we need good laws without any ambiguity which, as practice has shown, can be—and will be—used to preserve old attitudes and old methods.

Now we must not allow any repetition of past mistakes. It is necessary to preserve without fail the basic idea of the draft Law on the Cooperative System and prevent it from being transformed. The idea is to perceive the development of cooperative principles as principles which are consistently socialist, organically inherent in our economy, not alien to it but a law-governed part of it.

There is no readymade prescription of how to achieve this, how to avoid the preservation of old attitudes and administrative methods.... There are only the general demands: **Glasnost and the guarantee of a strictly democratic approach at all stages of the preparation and making of decisions.**

The approval of laws and other resolutions by the USSR Supreme Soviet and other central organs must turn from an act of formal approval into an act of truly meaningful discussion. If there are differences of opinion, then let us have separate headcount votes on every article. Let democracy work, let the will of the majority determine the content of every article!

Now it is no longer enough for a draft to be discussed by some working group or commission, followed by "wholesale" voting afterward. When a final decision is made in essence by a working group, we are again

departing from genuine democracy. Once again the real right to decide is vested not in the soviets of people's deputies at various levels—starting with local soviets and ending with the USSR Supreme Soviet—but by the working apparatus. It is this apparatus that remits drafts for all sorts of coordination and introduces amendments.

Preparatory work is very important, but it must not replace the procedure of democratic decisionmaking. Let me repeat: Right up to separate headcount votes on every article. So that every deputy's stance may be clear. So that everyone may know who personally voted for various articles. Ultimately, people who have elected a deputy are entitled to ask him, to demand an explanation why he voted in a particular way. But when a decision is made by a general vote, responsibility is diluted.

[Rytov] You have said nothing about the responsibility of science—economic, legal....

[Abalkin] Yes, science must also find its place in the system of our democracy and must perform its proper functions. For example, a conclusion on the draft of a law under discussion may be expressed by a group of specialists which could produce, say, a coreport or speak in opposition to the state commission which drafted the law. It should outline its motivations, arguments, and opinions warning against subjectivist decisions.

This does not mean that science is necessarily more correct. It could also be less correct—there are no guarantees here yet. But it must present its position and submit it for examination together with its arguments so that people who are making the decisions—even if they disagree with the scientists' views—could evaluate their possible consequences.

There is not and there never will be a mechanism guaranteeing society against mistakes and miscalculations. It is, however, important to find a system for the functioning of our democratic institutions which would reduce them to a minimum. The creation of such a system is part of the overall process of democratization. The radical reform of management and the democratization of social life are key elements of restructuring. This is neither a slogan nor an empty phrase—these are indeed the levers which will ensure the success of our transformations. I am convinced that the upcoming 19th all-union party conference will give a new and powerful impetus to this life-giving process.

Agricultural

Shvets Outlines Benefits of Lease Contract

PM2005144588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 May 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with economist Vasiliy Shvets by I. Abakumov under the rubric "Agricultural Review": "Rubric's Guest Economist Vasiliy Shvets Believes: 'The Lessee Is Capable of Feeding the Country...'"; date and place not given]

[Text] The above words are not just another declaration but a statement of a fact of real life. I can testify that Shvets knows what he is saying. But for his persistence, the Manshuk Mametova Sovkhoz would have been struck off the list of Tselinograd Oblast farms as an irredeemable bankrupt. However, since Vasiliy Vasilyevich became chief economist and began introducing the lease contract, people on the sovkhoz have come to love figures, particularly the "three." Labor productivity rose threefold in 3 years, production tripled, and prime costs fell by a factor of three. Instead of losses of R1 million, people there began making a profit of more than R1 million a year. There was in general nothing surprising, as you will realize, in the fact that Shvets was among those invited to the conference at the CPSU Central Committee on questions of the lease contract, where he made quite a long speech.

"Were you not once interrupted?" I asked him.

[Shvets] I spoke for approximately 40 minutes, instead of the 10 agreed upon. People listened with interest.

[Abakumov] But 5 years ago you were expelled from the party and put behind bars for introducing such ideas...

[Shvets] Indeed, I spent 18 months under investigation. At that time they realized very quickly the threat posed by the cost-cutting economic mechanism which I was trying to engage. You understand of whom and what I was speaking: A bureaucrat was being deprived of the possibility of ruling the roost and thereby warming his hands. The court was not quick to realize who was who, but better late than never. Last fall, after you visited the sovkhoz, I was admitted to the party as a candidate member.

[Abakumov] Thus you are once again a young Communist?

[Shvets] Just so: after 20 years in the party, and 11 of them in the role of party organizer. You could say that restructuring has brought me back to life. And I am not alone! The newspapers have already gotten tired of writing about such destinies...

[Abakumov] But have your enemies not grown tired? Last September, I remember, scientists of the Virgin Land Branch of the Kazakh Scientific Research Institute of Agricultural Economy all but accused Shvets of charlatanism. At that time you waved your hand and said: "To hell with them all." What would you say now?

[Shvets] I was wrong and thought that the lease contract would now make headway by itself. However, I soon saw for myself that, if you do not struggle for it, it can at best be misunderstood and at worst simply distorted, but in both cases it is discredited because it will not produce the expected results. Even in our Tselinograd Oblast, where I have visited 104 farms, people have managed to introduce a real lease contract on only four, while on the rest they have been able far from everywhere to avoid unsystematic campaigns in disseminating it. Say what you like, but stagnation habits are still strong among

farmers, and certain scientists are introducing a lot of confusion, each making his own comments on leasing in printed form—it is now a "fashionable" subject. Sometimes you read their "recommendations," and it is such drivel! You get the feeling that the author last saw a cow 10 years ago, and that was on television. And now I have to visit cities and villages and explain what leasing is and what it is all about. I recently returned from Chita Oblast, for example, where I spoke bluntly with machine operators: They are quick to understand, and you can see that they yearn for real work.

[Abakumov] Why is it, as you yourself feel, that you are frequently better understood by tractor drivers than by leaders of farms and organs of the agro-industrial complex?

[Shvets] I believe that all reasons must always be sought in human interest. What is the interest of the administrator? To maintain his influence over the tractor driver, who in turn seeks to escape from needless tutelage that is damaging to the cause. And the lease contract is entirely on the machine operator's side. We have cut the managerial personnel on our sovkhoz from 70 to 21 people. Such rumors spread instantly, and on hearing the word "lease" many administrators at once stiffen to the "alert," sensing either the danger of a cut or their own unsuitability for work under the new conditions. But whereas 5 years ago people would make short work of such ideas without bothering even about arguments, methods have now become more refined and "cunning." I have already spoken of certain scientific works. Another curious method of combating the lease contract has come to light: to introduce it everywhere without explaining anything to people clearly. In that case the failure of the idea is almost guaranteed. Incidentally, at the Central Committee conference Mikhail Sergeyevich also warned that the contract's dissemination should "not resemble total collectivization with all its excesses." Leasing is effective when someone undertakes it consciously and voluntarily.

[Abakumov] We are speaking increasingly of the problems of introduction. But from which problems does the lease contract deliver us?

[Shvets] First of all, the term "production relations" ceases to be vaguely scientific and becomes specific and understandable. The means of production acquire not a "universal" but a very real master: The tractor, the field, and the buildings are all leased. For it long ago became clear that what belongs to everyone at once belongs to no one. A lessee will never leave a tractor with its engine running while he has dinner. Whereas previously the administrator was the master, because he paid the machine operator's wages, now the team members themselves determine their economically accountable income. Labor ceases to be hired, and the very word "wages" vanishes from the vocabulary, like, incidentally, concepts such as "figure padding," "stealing," and others. Only a complete idiot would steal from himself.

[Abakumov] Are you in no hurry to draw conclusions? For whenever a contract innovation has appeared, statements have been made that here he is, master of the land, please give him a big hand. But a year later it turns out that it still pays that master to have his own private truck garden...

[Shvets] Under the lease contract, provided, of course, it is correctly understood, it pays a person to take something out of the house rather than into it. A system of contract prices at which the team sells the harvest to the sovkhoz and buys raw materials and semimanufactures must without fail operate within the farm. It is only then that it becomes possible to resolve in practice the specific task of producing sufficient produce to be able to settle accounts for the means of production leased and for the raw materials expended and secure an acceptable income for intensive labor. If contract prices do not exist on the sovkhoz, the contract will not work. Simplification is inadmissible here.

[Abakumov] People's attitude to work is changing, this is obvious. But how is the lease contract changing relations among people?

[Shvets] Judge for yourself. Part of the economically accountable income remained undistributed in the first team on our sovkhoz. The management advised leaving the money in the reserve fund, "for a rainy day." However, the collective unanimously decided to channel those funds into the construction of housing and a club and the modernization of the school. Could such a decision, and a voluntary one at that, have been made earlier? Of course not.

[Abakumov] Vasiliy Vasilyevich, what was the chief conclusion you drew from everything you heard at the CPSU Central Committee conference?

[Shvets] I got the feeling that people are relying on us. And again, we gained complete confidence in our rightness, such as has not existed before, and we received support at the highest level—that is the most important thing. Now I can convince absolutely anyone that the lessee will feed the country, and quickly. He cannot be stopped now.

Military

Gromyko Presents Awards, Details Achievements

LD2105172788 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 21 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In the Kremlin today Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko presented lofty state awards to internationalist servicemen.

The title Hero of the Soviet Union, with the presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal, have been conferred on Captain Yaroslavl Pavlovich Goroshko; Major General Pavel Sergeyevich Grachev; Sergeants Nikolay Ivanovich Kremenish and Yuriy Nikolayevich Mirolyubov; and Junior Sergeant Viktor Pavlovich Sinitskiy.

Addressing those awarded, Comrade Gromyko said:

[Begin recording] Henceforth, the Gold Star of a Hero of the Soviet Union and the Order of Lenin will shine on the chest of Capt Yaroslavl Pavlovich Goroshko. He is a determined and enterprising commander. Maj Gen Pavel Sergeyevich Grachev, commander of a guards airborne division, has become a Hero of the Soviet Union. Under his guidance the Soviet heroes carried out assaults through mountain ranges and acted daringly and courageously.

Sgt Nikolay Ivanovich Kreminish has shown himself to be a tried and tested serviceman and a man of oustanding courage. In one of the battles he did not falter. He used his body to shield his commander and saved him. Yuriy Nikolayevich Mirolyubov also distinguished himself. In a battle Yuriy Nikolayevich Mirolyubov replaced a machine gunner who was put out of action, and thus effected the outcome of the battle, which ended in victory. Junior Sergeant Viktor Pavlovich Sinitskiy is a driver mechanic. His biography is grim and heroic. He has been involved in mine explosions several times, and suffered four concussions. Three times in battle conditions he repaired a damaged vehicle and always displayed restraint, coolness, and a will for victory.

Allow me once again to congratulate you cordially on receiving the lofty awards of our country. I have particular pleasure in conveying to you congratulations from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. [applause] [end recording]

Comrade Demichev attended the presentation of the awards.